

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Florence Nightingale, National Hospital Week, and Speech by Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 135th anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, the founder of nursing methods as we know them today. During the Crimean War Miss Nightingale raised a band of nurses and took them to the Turkish military hospital at Scutari, on the Bosphorus. On November 4, 1854, she assumed control of the hospital and introduced system and order where indescribable chaos had reigned—and thereby laid the foundations of modern scientific nursing.

But Florence Nightingale is known for more than her heroic deeds in the Crimea. As Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service, says in the appended speech:

All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale.

To Florence Nightingale we owe both the high professional standards and the system of professional education which has given us 390,000 active professional nurses in America today. Other American nurses are giving their services throughout the world. Among them are such women as Mary Mills, of the United States Public Health Service, Chief Nurse, on a technical-assistance mission to Lebanon for the Foreign Operations Administration. I understand that Miss Mills has just been awarded the Lebanese Order of Merit by the Minister of Public Health for establishing the new Makafid School of Nursing in that Near Eastern nation. Miss Mills was previously decorated by the Liberian Government for a comparable feat.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

This week we are observing another major influence on the good health of Americans through National Hospital Week. Just recently I delivered an address at the oldest hospital in the United States, the 200-year-old Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia. The tradition of that fine institution reminded me of how far we have come since the days when hospitals were considered places to die.

Today hospitals are the centers of our community's health services, and our national and State hospital associations are working hard to provide the highest quality care for all Americans.

In the past several years there has been a great increase in hospital con-

struction. This is due both to the stimulus offered by the Hill-Burton Act, and to the determination of the States and communities that their citizens should receive the full benefit of new advances in the medical sciences.

It has been estimated that the number of persons in the United States without access to acceptable general hospital services has been reduced from 10 million in 1947 to less than 4 million last year. New hospitals in rural areas are attracting physicians and other health personnel. Most new hospitals are using sound architectural practices. They are making provisions for consultation services in such fields as pathology, roentgenology, and other diagnostic services. All of these factors contribute to better care of the American people.

There is still ever so much to be done, with facilities for the chronically ill and for mental patients still in very scarce supply. But we are making progress, and that is what is important.

During National Hospital Week and the anniversary of Florence Nightingale, we should all offer our sincerest thanks to the men and women in the health professions who have dedicated their lives to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering, and to preventing needless death.

ARNSTEIN SPEECH

Under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech by one of the leaders of the nursing profession, Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, Chief of the Division of Nursing Resources of the United States Public Health Service. Her address was made before the section on historical and cultural medicine of the New York Academy of Medicine in New York City, May 11, 1955:

THE INFLUENCE OF FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE ON NURSING

Modern nursing derives so completely from the example and teaching of Florence Nightingale that it is hard to pick out the particular practices that owe their existence to her influence. All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale—that her name is a synonym for nursing. She demonstrated in a dramatic fashion in the Crimea that nursing—and sanitation—could reduce mortality, as Dr. Berry will describe to you.

The medical profession has long recognized the essential role of nursing in care of patients and prevention of illness. The Academy of Medicine tonight in paying tribute to Florence Nightingale, is paying tribute to the contribution nursing makes to medical practice.

Nursing literally did not exist, except in a few religious orders, until Miss Nightingale showed what it could do, and more important, established a school to produce people who could do it. This first school at St. Thomas' Hospital in London was a model for all the later schools in England and the United States. Nightingale nurses became heads of all the early schools established in England. Bellevue Hospital School of Nursing in New York, the first in this country to introduce the Nightingale principles, was ac-

tually guided by letters from Miss Nightingale.

This evening I would like to detach Miss Nightingale's principles from their historical setting and discuss them in relation to modern nursing. To do this one must recognize that Miss Nightingale had both a good influence and a bad influence on nursing. Most of the bad influence is due to the fact that we have slavishly followed some practices she strongly advocated, long after the need for them has disappeared. Some of it is due to the fact that we have continued with practices she initiated, but have ignored the underlying principles which she set forth.

The influences that have outlived their social usefulness are almost entirely related to the conduct of student nurses. When Miss Nightingale started the first training school, the Nightingale nurse, in the words of one of her biographers, "had to establish her character in a profession proverbial for its immorality."

The probationers, as students were called, had their entire lives controlled by the school as though in a convent. They had 2 hours of outdoor exercise each day, outside the dormitory. They were never allowed to leave the dormitory alone. All other time was scheduled: meals, work and learning, and sleep. All this control probably was necessary at that time. The fact that some of it has lingered on into the middle of the 20th century shows we did not consider the reason for the practice but clung to the practice itself long after the respectability of nursing was established, and young women in our society had attained much more independence.

Miss Nightingale herself recognized the danger of stereotyping. In the paper, *Sick Nursing and Health Nursing*, that she read in Chicago in 1893, when she was in her seventies, she said, "No system can endure that does not march."

On the other hand, if we had followed as closely all else that she taught, we would not now be trying to undo so much of what we recently have been teaching and doing in this country in nursing.

This astonishing person had such vision and understanding that I sometimes think a school of nursing today could not do better than read from her writings each morning a lesson for the day. The lesson could then be expanded with the knowledge of human relations and with the scientific facts we have acquired since her day, but I doubt that many new lessons would be needed.

It is a little disconcerting to realize some of our most modern ideas—that are still opposed by some nurses and some of the related professions—that these dangerous new ideas were taught by Miss Nightingale 95 years ago. Our leaders in nursing today have come to these ideas quite independently and have contributed greatly to getting us back on the track and several miles ahead of the point where we went off.

We might consider these ideas under three main headings: care of the patient in the hospital and in the home; administration of nursing services; and education of nurses.

About care of the patient, the most advanced members of the nursing profession are stressing the idea that we must nurse the whole patient and not just his disease. Miss Nightingale expressed the same principle. She said, "The art is that of nursing the sick." And she added, "Please mark—nursing the sick; not nursing sickness."

Her definition of nursing the sick included giving the medicines and stimulants prescribed, and the surgical appliances, proper use of fresh air, warmth, and cleanliness,

proper choosing and giving the diet, and quiet. All this was to be done, she wrote, "at least expense of vital power of the sick."

Psychosomatic medicine is a relatively new concept, yet the great physicians and nurses of the past recognized the influence of emotions on disease conditions. In writing about the care of patients, Miss Nightingale gave attention to the ways a patient's illness is affected by his state of mind, his worries and fears, the attractiveness or drabness of his surroundings, and the noise around him. She summed it up as follows:

"The symptoms or the sufferings generally considered to be inevitable and incident to the disease are very often not symptoms of the disease at all, but of something quite different—of the want of fresh air * * * or of quiet or of cleanliness or of punctuality. * * * The reparative process * * * has been hindered * * * by some want in one or in all of these things."

We can almost hear the modern cardiologist saying, as she did, "Apprehension, uncertainty, waiting, expectation, fear of surprise, do a patient more harm than any exertion."

Psychiatrists today teach us that the type of reassurance which tells a patient not to worry, the operation will not amount to anything, he will be all right, and other such encouragements, often defeats its own end. Today we believe that listening to the patient, the process we call nondirective interviewing, is actually more helpful. Although we did not learn this principle from Florence Nightingale, we might have done so. Although no one had ever heard of "nondirective interviewing," Miss Nightingale admonished, "Do not cheer the sick by making light of their danger," and continued at length to discuss the understanding of patients' fears and their individual differences.

In recent years we have recognized that color affects the productivity of industrial workers, and are now experimenting with the effect of color on patients. Although Miss Nightingale made no controlled experiments, she observed keenly, and in this instance her observations have been proved correct by later scientific experiments. "Little as we know about the way in which we are affected by form, by color, and light," she wrote, "we do know this, they have actual physical effect." Another observation from her writing of the same period was: "No one who has watched the sick can doubt the fact that some feel stimulus from looking at scarlet flowers, exhaustion from looking at deep blue, etc."

On the other hand, Miss Nightingale recognized that the connection between mind and body is not a one-way street. She said she wished "a little more was thought of the effect of the body on the mind." Today we recognize this fact and no longer say, as we did some years ago, that a patient "is or is not cooperative." We try to understand why he complains, or why he is angry, or why he resists treatment. Miss Nightingale summed up the patient's difficulties so succinctly that we might repeat her words everyday: "Almost any sick person, who behaves decently well, exercises more self-control every moment of his day than you will ever know till your are sick yourself."

Until recently, the recognition given Florence Nightingale by the nursing profession has been primarily for her work in establishing decent standards of nursing care for patients and starting a system of training for those who give the care. Yet perhaps her real genius was in the management field. She may have been so far ahead of her time that we did not appreciate the principles she bequeathed us; we have had to discover them for ourselves. Nurses, like hospital administrators, have gone to industry and business for ideas on better management. So we cannot say that Miss Nightingale has in-

fluenced our profession greatly in this aspect of nursing service. Yet she knew the basic principles of good management and expressed them so well I would like to quote part of her statement on the first requirement of an administrator:

"To be 'in charge' is certainly not only to carry out the proper measures yourself but to see that everyone else does so too. * * * It is neither to do everything yourself nor to appoint a number of people to the (same) duty."

Miss Nightingale had much to say about applying this principle and other principles of good management. In 1858 she advocated conserving the nurse's time and energy in almost the exact same words that were used in 1955 in a recommendation growing out of a recent time study of nursing activities. I quote from the report by a Michigan hospital:

"Following the study made in our hospital we now have a messenger service that brings supplies and drugs to the patient units and transports patients from place to place in the hospital."

Miss Nightingale said that "nothing should be fetched by the nurses," and that "the nurse should never be obliged to quit her floor except for her own dinner and supper." She had a scheme to make this possible—more revolutionary in her day than pneumatic tubes in ours—a "windlass installation," or lift to bring up the patients' food. She also had a scheme for saving work by having hot water piped up to every floor. Without systems of this kind, she said, the nurse is converted into a pair of legs.

She was not only an administrator but an inventor of labor-saving devices. The intercommunicating system at which we marvel today seems only a natural descendant of her suggestion that "the bells of patients should all ring in the passage outside the nurse's door on that story and should have a valve which flies open when its bell rings and remains open in order that the nurse may see who has rung."

Perhaps some of Miss Nightingale's ideas have remained dormant in nurses' consciousness like recessive characteristics. Even today only the more progressive hospitals have written job descriptions for all nursing personnel. We rather timidly suggest that the good staff nurse should receive recognition through higher pay and more responsibility without necessarily having to become an administrator.

Miss Nightingale said in 1858, in her subsidiary notes as to the introduction of female nursing into military hospitals, that the duties of each nurse, senior and junior, and of the orderly should be clearly outlined. She also wrote: "Many women are valuable as nurses who are yet unfit for promotion to head nurses. It appears to me that it would be desirable to have intermediate recompense."

The recent studies to which I referred have analyzed the pattern of interruptions in the head nurse's activities and have shown that the head nurse seldom spends as much as 5 minutes on an activity without being interrupted. Miss Nightingale had a gloomy outlook for people who spent their days in this fashion. She said, "I have never known persons who exposed themselves for years to constant interruption who did not muddle away their intellects by it at last."

Examples of her astute understanding of administration and her inventiveness could be multiplied for the rest of the evening. I shall quote only one more, under the heading of administration: "Unless the matron's authority is supported by the principal medical officer, the patients always suffer." When we read Miss Nightingale's writings we are never in danger of forgetting the patient.

In the field of nursing education, we have been grappling with numerous perplexing problems and divergent ideas in recent years. Here again Miss Nightingale offered many ideas that today would be considered progressive, perhaps even radical. Many students of our system of nursing education maintain that the school of nursing should be independent of the hospital. It is interesting to note that the first school of nursing, the Nightingale School at St. Thomas' Hospital in London, had its own endowment fund and its own board of managers.

The first schools in this country, at Bellevue and Massachusetts General Hospitals, were not established primarily to insure better care of the sick, but to educate nurses. The impetus for these schools came not from the physicians or the hospitals, but from the New York State Charities, and from the Women's Education Association in Boston. Each was directed initially by its own board of managers.

Recent studies of costs of schools of nursing have wrestled with the question, "Should nursing service personnel, head nurses, and others contribute to the education of the students?" In the Nightingale school, the head nurses and the director of nurses were paid part of their salaries from the Nightingale fund for the training of students. So we at least have a precedent for this practice.

Some of us have believed that having the students work full time on the wards was "the good old way." Yet even in Miss Nightingale's era, when theory was a much smaller part of the preparation for any profession than it is now, Miss Nightingale stated as one of the essentials of a training school that "there shall be an organization which by giving proper help in the wards gives probationers time to do their work as pupils as well as give service to patients. Seventy years later we are proposing not a completely different philosophy of training, but rather more of the pupil and less of the service."

Nursing educators are convinced of the necessity of students understanding the reasons behind the things they do—of the value of the case-study method of teaching. Miss Nightingale must be nodding her head in approval. Her spirit perhaps is murmuring "at last." For in 1882 she wrote, "We require a special organization for the purpose of training." Then she explained:

"Training is to teach not only what is to be done * * * not only how to do it, but why such and such a thing is done, and not such and such another; as also to teach symptoms, and what symptoms indicate what of a disease or change, and the 'reason why' of such symptoms."

"Without time for these things, average nurse-probationers degenerate into conceited ward drudges. Without a system for these things, they potter and cobble out their year about the patients, and make not much progress in real nursing—that is, in obeying the physicians' and surgeons' orders intelligently and perfectly."

In her forthright way, Miss Nightingale's predicted dire things for the students if we do not give them proper training.

She summarized so well all the attributes we want in a nurse today that I am going to end with this quotation:

"Training is to teach a nurse to know her business, that is, to observe exactly, to understand, to know exactly, to do, to tell exactly, in such stupendous issues as life and death, health, and disease."

"Training is to enable the nurse to act for the best in carrying out her orders, not as a machine but as a nurse; as an intelligent and responsible being. Training has to make her, not servile, but loyal to medical orders and authorities. True loyalty to orders cannot be without the independent sense of responsibility, which alone secures real trustworthiness."

Townsend Convention Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address I made before the National Townsend Convention at St. Petersburg, Fla., on May 2, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Townsend, distinguished guests, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a source of personal inspiration to see so many of you here at this, your 15th convention, and to look back on your significant accomplishments under the leadership of your beloved Dr. Townsend.

It is fitting that you have chosen to meet in this beautiful city of St. Petersburg. It is known throughout the land as a haven for our retired senior citizens. I am sure that your visit here will be a most pleasant one.

I come to talk with you, briefly, on a matter in which you, and millions of other American citizens, are deeply interested. I come also to pay a tribute to the founder of your organization, Dr. Francis E. Townsend. In all our land, no other person has done more to improve the lot of the senior citizens of our country. His efforts have done much in lightening the burden of our old folks and in making possible for them a better opportunity for a decent livelihood in their retirement.

I know that the pages of history will duly record his tremendous contribution to the well-being of his fellowmen. His perseverance and courage against overwhelming obstacles serve as inspiration to all of us, and to those who will follow along the path toward social and economic justice which he has so clearly marked.

This 15th convention has been most aptly entitled the "Torchlight Convention." Truly, the purpose of this gathering is to light the torch of truth, showing the way to a better tomorrow for the senior citizens of the Nation and for our younger folks to look forward to.

I have always admired the Townsend organization because of its sincere concern with the problems of people. In this day of increasing mechanization and preoccupation with such things as automation, A- and H-bombs, guided missiles, V-8 engines, television, and other mechanical and technical advancements, it is encouraging to find such a dedicated organization striving to obtain for our old folks an equitable share of the Nation's abundance which you have helped to create.

You have made outstanding progress in an area where any progress is difficult. The struggle for social reform is a constant uphill fight. Tremendous pressures for inertia must be overcome before any advances can be made.

Great gains have been won. And although you have not obtained your objective for adequate insurance or retirement benefits for elderly citizens, you have made great progress. You have been a tremendous force for good. You can rightfully claim much of the credit for improvements that have been made in State and Federal legislation pertaining to problems of the aged. You are a force for good because you put human values above everything else.

We need only to refer to history to find illustrations of successful campaigns which have been won against the forces of social inaction. Some of these fights have taken

many decades, others hundreds or even thousands of years.

Consider the struggle over the ages for the realization of the inherent worth and dignity of the human spirit. From the days of Christ, man has been taught that human dignity and spiritual values transcend all other values. The basic elements of Christianity teach that we are all God's children and that we are important in His plan. This teaching survived the tyranny of the Roman Empire, the Dark Ages and was reborn in the renaissance. Down through the centuries man has struggled to break the chains of feudalism, political and religious persecution and to improve his status. Our own forefathers came to America to find a freedom which was denied them in their native lands.

Yes, the struggle for freedom and social progress for the individual has carried down into our own lifetime. We have achieved a measure of freedom and dignity unsurpassed in all of the history of the world. But we continue to fight for an even better life for ourselves and our children and our grandchildren because there still are inequities today which need remedying.

Some of the struggles for social progress have been of a shorter duration, but nonetheless intense. The fight against the inhuman institution of slavery in this country lasted almost a hundred years, and was won at the fearful cost of human lives and suffering in a great Civil War.

Woman suffrage was not achieved until the recent past, after decades and decades of agitation. No, my friends, real social progress is not easy to win. It is a continuing struggle against powerful forces who seek to maintain the status quo and who fear change.

Your program is one which should attract interest from young people as well as old folks. The young man or woman who has the foresight and vision to look ahead, will be interested in the kind of Federal insurance, or social-security program that will adequately provide for them in their twilight years. Young people are naturally concerned about the welfare of their parents and that, too, should interest them in a security program that is adequate in meeting the needs of their elders.

We are not much concerned about the name of a program so long as the objective is to adequately compensate retired citizens and to provide for them the opportunity to properly share in the abundance with which this Nation is blessed.

Any program of social reform which gives a break to the average citizen will always be denounced by those who traditionally have opposed social legislation and social progress.

The objective you seek will one day be realized. It would be unrealistic to expect it to come without great effort and sacrifice, for social reform unfortunately does not move as fast as we would like.

Progress has been slowed down by those who say that the Nation cannot afford a program such as yours or, even programs which are not as far advanced as yours. They ignore the facts that one of our Nation's great problems today is how to meet the challenge of abundance.

We are worried about the great surpluses of farm products. We are concerned because the storehouses are filled with all sorts of electrical gadgets, automobiles, and other items essential for good living. It seems to me that the question is whether we can afford to hold back on programs for adequate retirement benefits. Can we afford to block plans to raise the living level of millions of American workingmen and women and their families who now live on incomes that are not adequate to provide the kind of livelihood and opportunities they are entitled to?

There is something seriously wrong when millions of our fellow citizens are suffering because of the lack of goods which the Na-

tion has in such great abundance. Some folks say we are living beyond our means. They suggest that because of this great abundance we should adjust ourselves downward and backward. Because there is so much of everything they believe people should live on less. That, to me, does not make good sense.

In this great land of ours there is no good reason why everyone should not have the opportunity for a full, happy, and productive life.

In order to build an expanding, full employment economy we must make it possible for our old folks to share in our economic progress. This is one of your aims and it is sound. Increased purchasing power is the key to a brighter tomorrow. Millions of citizens now barely able to exist on meager pensions, inadequate unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, or public assistance today constitute a great potential force for economic advancement if they are given the opportunity to share in the Nation's wealth.

Our Nation was founded by men who had a deep and abiding faith in human progress and a humble respect for the needs of our people. Democracy can be hurt only in times of chaos and in an atmosphere of fear, uncertainty, and hopelessness.

Your own organization was born in the grim days of depression. You remember well that panic which seized our people when our economy was in a state of collapse because of policies which ignored the welfare of the average American. We must remember well the lessons we learned 25 years ago and resist any attempts to again take us down the road to economic disaster.

I regret to say that already I see some of the same danger signals of the 1920's in certain policies of the present administration. The ill-fated "hard money" policy has already forced increases in the interest rates on Government securities and has worked a hardship on borrowers and small businesses. Preoccupation with the alleged needs for encouraging investments has taken precedence over the real needs of the average American for tax relief and resulting increases in purchasing power.

Some people in the administration believe that a float of unemployment is essential in a competitive society in order to keep production on a high level. They overlook human values and fail to see the suffering that comes to several million American families who are compelled to live on inadequate unemployment insurance, public assistance or private charity. They fail to see the tremendous waste in human and natural resources that comes with idle men, idle machines and idle factories.

The real waste in our Nation today is the loss in national output because of this backward adjustment and fear of abundance. This loss last year amounted to something like \$30 billion. It does not make sense that several million workers who desperately seek work in our country today are unable to get jobs, particularly when there is so much work to do. There is a great need, all over the country, for more and better schools. There is a crying need for hospitals and increased medical care for our citizens. In all parts of our great country there is the need for the building of highways and expansion of water, sewer, sanitary systems and the like. There is a great new field for employment in serving the millions of people for whom new avenues have opened for longer vacations, travel, recreation and culture because of automation and increased productive power.

We need not fear abundance. We should not be frightened about a program which would permit all of our citizens, and particularly our deserving senior citizens to fully share in the necessities and luxuries of life which we, as a Nation, have in such great abundance.

If we have the vision, our productive capacity can provide more leisure. It need

not be unemployment and suffering amid plenty. If we have the vision, abundance should be cause for rejoicing, not confusion, fear, and sorrow.

But, shortsighted economic thinking and philosophy which we had hoped was discredited, dead and buried in the great depression, is now making its reincarnation. I am seriously alarmed at some striking resemblances to the predepression administration which are now appearing on the present-day Washington scene.

In my opinion the present administration is not concerning itself with the problems of people but is focusing more and more attention on the health of the stock market, the banking interests, and the profit figures of our giant corporations.

The administration should realize that the needs of our aged are becoming more critical each year. The number of persons over 65 years of age is increasing at the rate of over 1,000 persons a day. Senior citizens now make up over 8 percent of our total population and the proportion is rising rapidly as medical science makes new discoveries which prolong our life expectancy.

The hard fact of the matter is that our social and economic advances have not nearly kept pace with our medical, scientific, and technical advances. Concern for human needs has been shoved aside in the mad race for profits and economic power. But how can we achieve real and lasting progress unless the needs of our aged are given the serious consideration they deserve? Today, even middle-aged workers are being discriminated against in employment opportunities. What happens to these citizens who can no longer find employment? A few have been able to accumulate savings in their lifetime, however meager. But how far will savings go when the cost of living remains at such a high level. Some aged persons are cared for by children or relatives, but we know of the natural desire for independence and freedom of action.

One of the most effective ways which the administration could begin to meet the problems of the aged would be in supporting a housing plan for the older citizens of this Nation.

An example of how this plan could be geared to the needs of our aged is to be found in Cleveland, where a public housing development has set aside 100 apartments, with special provisions such as elevators, nonslip floors, handrails and other fixtures which would make life easier for old people.

Rent in such a project would be low and independence would be assured without isolation, since the apartments are a part of a larger development which would have occupants of all ages. This is the type of program which the Federal Government should undertake on a nationwide scale to reassert its interest and concern for the needs of our growing aged population.

Of course, the Federal Government must begin to face up to the realities of the basic financial needs of the senior citizens. Present levels of benefits under the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are pitifully inadequate despite recent increases. Even \$100 a month pension would be little enough to buy the bare necessities of life. Millions of Americans are trying to exist today on far less than that. Coverage, while extended recently, still does not provide for aged persons not eligible for benefits at the time of their retirement because of limited original coverage and other disqualifications. Permanently and totally disabled persons are discriminated against under the present law.

I share your views that our present social security law is far from adequate. But it can, and will be improved, as more citizens show an interest in their Government and in legislation that means so much to themselves and their families. We can make our social security law whatever we want it to

be when we arouse enough public support.

Dr. Townsend has displayed wisdom in looking toward his objective. He is realistic enough to know that it requires organization, work, and effort. He has called attention to the great need for unity and action on the part of elderly folks throughout the Nation. He has wisely suggested that you make common cause with organizations of working men and women who are your strongest allies. Labor organizations are made up of members, who like yourself, are deeply concerned about humane problems and about the security of our senior citizens.

Don't forget, there are some in this country who would like to destroy social security, not because they want something better, but because they don't like security at all for the average citizen. They don't like welfare programs. The security that comes regularly with an old-age insurance or pension check—something that is yours as a matter of right—gives to old folks a sense of dignity, self-respect, and independence.

Some folks don't want you to be independent. They don't want you to be in a position where you can't be pushed around or be told what to do. Old-age insurance or retirement pension legislation, or whatever you wish to call it, can be improved to the extent that people desire, if they have the initiative to exert themselves and to apply themselves to the task that must be done.

There is really no need to worry about the financial soundness of the social security system. Social security is just as good and strong as your Government.

The real test, as to whether the Nation can and will adequately provide for retired folks and for all of our people will finally depend upon whether or not we have the real wealth in human and natural resources and in food and other essential goods.

In closing I must say a good word about my friends, Mrs. Ford and Mr. ELLIOTT. They are doing a good job for you in Washington and have the respect of my colleagues in the Congress.

Dr. Townsend is also greatly admired by Members of the Congress for his outstanding leadership in your great cause.

Many Members of Congress have signed the Townsend petition requesting that consideration be given to your program in committees and on the floor of the Congress.

Although this objective has not been achieved, your work has been most fruitful in that it has had a powerful impact on bringing about improvements in social security.

In this beautiful Florida city are a number of people who have come here from my congressional district. I had the pleasure of meeting some dear friends only a few moments ago. I refer to Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Birch, who are now residents of this city and are with us here in the convention hall. Mr. Birch was a prominent citizen of Reading, Pa., and for many years principal of the boys high school. I was one of his students.

I regret that I can't stay here a few days instead of rushing back to Washington. To all of you, my sincere best wishes. May you enjoy continued success in advancing a just cause to which you are so faithfully devoted.

Long-Short Haul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I

include herewith a letter from Chairman Richard Mitchell, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and a statement from the Commission giving its justification for a bill I have introduced today by request of the Commission:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

The Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST,

Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRIEST: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies of a draft of a bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, together with a statement of justification of the bill.

After an intensive review of the operation of the fourth section of the act, with particular reference to its impact on the work of the Commission and the ratemaking function of the rail carriers, the Commission has come to the definite conclusion that this section should be amended so as to eliminate therefrom all unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, but at the same time retain the central objective of the fourth section, i. e., departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over direct routes.

The Commission would be very grateful for your assistance in introducing the bill and giving it early consideration.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft of proposed bill is intended to amend section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to remove therefrom all unnecessary and unduly burdensome refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, which principle was originally designed to prevent the specific discriminatory practice of charging more for a shorter than for a longer haul. That principle is still valid today.

Section 4 (1) of the act now prohibits any common carrier subject to part I or part III thereof from charging or receiving any greater compensation for the transportation of passengers, or like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance, or from charging any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of part I or III. It further provides that upon application the Commission may, in special cases, after investigation, authorize such carriers to charge less for the longer than for the shorter distances, and that the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated carrier may be relieved from the operation of the section, except that in exercising such authority the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed.

The proposed amendment is specifically designed to make the fourth section self-operating with respect to the right of a circuitous route to meet the rate or rates legally established between competitive points over the more direct routes. No further authorization from the Commission would be required other than the standards laid down by other sections of the act. As an incident of this suggested change we are proposing to remove from section 4 the so-called reasonably compensatory provision. This, in our opinion, would eliminate from section 4 all of the unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, would terminate our responsibility with respect to

fourth-section departures over circuitous routes, and would limit our jurisdiction to authorizations of relief over direct routes, upon application and after investigation, where special justification for such relief is shown.

Experience has demonstrated that the public interest is not being served by the imposition of the restrictions in question. The history of their administration has proved them to be excessively burdensome to all concerned. Together they have resulted in disproportionate expenditures of time, labor, and funds by both the carriers and the Commission in comparison with the relatively small benefits derived. Moreover, almost all of the dissatisfaction with section 4, which is expressed periodically by carriers and shippers alike, appears to stem from the same burdensome provisions.

Section 4 has been highly controversial since its inception both as to its substantive provisions and as to the manner and extent of its administration. In implementing this section the Commission initially adopted a vigorous policy, but due to the early attitude of the courts, especially the narrow interpretation given the words "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions" (which were contained in the original act) in *I. C. C. v. Alabama Midland Ry. Co.* (163 U. S. 144 (1897)), the Commission was compelled to abandon, at least temporarily, its forceful approach.

The enactment of the Mann-Elkins Act, June 8, 1910, however, gave new life to the section by eliminating the phrase "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions"; and, as set forth in that act, section 4 appeared to contain all the essentials necessary for effective and efficient administration. The Transportation Act of 1920, however, added two refinements, viz, the

"reasonably compensatory" provision and the so-called "equidistant" provision which proved to be troublesome. The latter provision was repealed by the Transportation Act of 1940, at which time the "reasonably compensatory" provision did not appear to be quite so objectionable by comparison. In retrospect, however, it is now equally clear that the carriers should not be required to secure our permission for the publication of rates over circuitous routes equivalent to the going rates over direct routes when in their managerial discretion such rates are necessary because of competitive factors.

The Commission is now firmly of the view that the "reasonably compensatory" provision no longer serves any useful purpose, and that it may well be eliminated from section 4 without jeopardizing the public interest. And, in this connection, we wish to point out that under other sections of the act the Commission is constantly seeking assurance that all rates subject to its jurisdiction, including those published under section 4, are not unjust or unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, nor unduly prejudicial or preferential. For this reason we do not believe that the proposed amendment would detract substantially from our jurisdiction, but would, on the other hand, allow us greater discretion in the administration of this section, which should inure to the benefit of the carriers and the public as well.

It is our view that the central principle of the fourth section, i. e., control of departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over the direct routes—is sound and should be retained, and that enactment of the proposed amendment would serve to streamline section 4. It would likewise enhance our administrative effectiveness and relieve the carriers of an unnecessary burden.

Public-Opinion Survey—11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth consecutive year, I have conducted a public-opinion survey among the constituents of my congressional district, and this year mailed out 19,700 questionnaires, of which 250 were returned undelivered, showing a net mailing of 19,450.

To date, 3,520 questionnaires have been returned and tabulated, which represents 18.1 percent of the net mailing and which, according to professional sampling criteria, is a very good return.

Besides the 4,200 people on my semi-monthly newsletter mailing list, the questionnaire was sent into every precinct in the district to people picked at random without prior knowledge of their political affiliation, so that the distribution accomplished was as fair as was humanly possible and indicates that a typical cross-section of the constituency was sampled. The results of the survey are as follows:

	Yes	Per- cent	No	Per- cent	No an- swer	Per- cent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	2,445	69.5	996	28.3	79	2.2
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?	1,579	44.9	1,753	49.8	188	5.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?	1,759	50.0	1,622	46.0	139	4.0
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	2,004	56.9	1,066	30.3	450	12.8
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	2,298	65.3	840	23.9	382	10.8
6. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, just off the Chinese mainland, if these islands are attacked by Chinese Communist forces?	1,221	34.7	2,069	58.8	230	6.5
7. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend Formosa if it is attacked by Chinese Communists?	2,206	62.7	1,136	32.3	178	5.0
8. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public housing program?	1,921	54.6	1,477	41.9	122	3.5
9. Do you favor the Federal Government reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical plans?	1,530	43.5	1,750	49.7	240	6.8
10. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's 10-year highway-construction program requiring the expenditure of \$101 billion?	2,680	76.1	717	20.4	123	3.5
11. Do you favor the administration's educational proposal in which the Federal Government share would be \$1.1 billion, of which \$200 million would be in grants, the rest in loans to support local and State school bonds?	2,539	72.1	842	23.9	139	4.0
12. Do you favor a program of universal military training requiring every man to spend some time in military training and then have to join the Reserves?	2,320	65.9	1,103	31.3	97	2.8
13. Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii with a population of 499,794 (1950 census)?	2,696	76.6	674	19.1	150	4.3
14. Do you approve of statehood for Alaska with a population of 108,543 (1950 census)?	2,664	75.7	697	19.8	159	4.5
15. Do you favor revealing to the American public more of our foreign agreements such as the recently disclosed Yalta documents?	2,852	81.0	567	16.1	101	2.9
16. Do you believe we are spending enough for military security? (The estimated budget expenditure for 1956 is \$62.4 billion; 65 percent of this or \$40.5 billion is for major national military security.)	2,768	78.7	487	13.8	265	7.5
17. Do you think the average American company can pay its employees a guaranteed annual wage?	1,202	34.1	2,067	58.7	251	7.2
18. Do you favor President Eisenhower's conducting personal talks with the heads of the Russian and British Governments?	2,311	65.7	1,045	29.7	164	4.6
19. Do you approve of a questionnaire of this type as a means of helping a Congressman to know the thinking of his constituents?	3,451	98.0	38	1.1	31	.9

Five of the questions asked in this year's survey were identical in content

and similarly worded in 1954 and 1953, and a comparison of the results over

these 3 years is as follows:

	Percentages								
	1955			1954			1953 ¹		
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?.....	69.5	28.3	2.2	67.0	29.9	3.1	64.1	35.9	
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?.....	44.9	49.8	5.3	45.7	46.4	7.9	44.7	55.3	
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?.....	50.0	46.0	4.0	54.4	38.8	6.8	43.3	56.7	
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?.....	56.9	30.3	12.8	52.9	36.6	10.5	78.5	21.5	
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?.....	65.3	23.9	10.8	58.0	25.9	16.1	84.2	15.8	

¹ It is to be noted that in the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers tabulated in the 1953 questionnaire, the "no answers" were not included in the percentage breakdown.

Soroptimist of the Month: Congresswoman From the First Idaho District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time an article from the April 1955 issue of the American Soroptimist which pays tribute to the charming lady from Idaho, the able and conscientious Congresswoman from the First District, Mrs. GRACIE FROST. Mrs. FROST is the only soroptimist in the United States Congress, and this outstanding organization has recognized her devoted service to the good people of her district, State, and Nation by naming her as the soroptimist of the month.

Mrs. FROST and I both came to Congress in 1953. Since the beginning of the 83d Congress I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Mrs. FROST on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and on several of the subcommittees of that committee. Consequently I have had many opportunities to observe her effective work and her development into a very capable legislator. She has performed admirably for the good people of her district and is dedicated to their service. Her recognition as the soroptimist of the month is a reward she justly deserves.

Therefore I have asked permission to place in the RECORD this article so that our colleagues may know the honor that has been conferred upon our Gracie.

The article follows:

SOROPTIMIST OF THE MONTH: CONGRESSWOMAN FROM THE FIRST IDAHO DISTRICT—GRACIE FROST, CALDWELL (IDAHO) CLUB

Service—personal, intimate service to the people and the community has been the keynote in the rise of Mrs. GRACIE FROST, personable Congresswoman from the First Idaho District and the only Soroptimist in Congress.

Twenty years ago she was a young deputy in the county clerk's office, where her more interesting work was the issuance of marriage licenses and the making out of the county warrants. These were depression days, and conditions in the agricultural area were rough.

The young and gracious county official made the problem of each person who came to her her own. In businesslike, personal style, she helped those caught in the complexity of filing legal papers work out their problem.

Friends saw in the dynamic, freckle-faced young redhead a person qualifying for higher responsibility—maybe county clerk—at a future date. For 9 years, she dispensed pleasant, personal service in this position, winning political opponents as well as political friends by the service she gave.

Then came the step-up. The position of county treasurer seemed to be available, and Gracie declared herself a candidate.

"If there is a person in Canyon County Mrs. FROST does not know by first name, it's because she hasn't visited the maternity ward in the hospital lately," a political op-

ponent remarked in discussing the election prospects.

Five consecutive times the voters trooped to the polls to elect GRACIE FROST—always by heavy majorities. And she smilingly continued to dispense the same service.

"She listens too well and doesn't talk enough," was the bitter comment of an opponent who could not trap Mrs. FROST in public debate over issues beyond the jurisdiction of her office. She would discuss freely the problems of her office and the matters pertaining to its efficient operation, and confined herself to matters which were her business.

Her campaigning consisted largely of meeting people and listening. Everyone wanted to tell her how she should campaign. She listened to everyone—and they surprisingly found themselves campaigning for her.

In 1950 she announced her candidacy for the congressional position from the First District. "Gracie is overreaching herself," her political opponents chortled, contending that she was not qualified for so high an office.

Her friends, knowing the First Idaho District, also feared she was overreaching—but for a different reason. The district extends from the Snake River in the southwest, northward and eastward, and includes the panhandle. Its interests include forestry, mining, grazing, cattle raising, as well as irrigation farming.

First District Congressmen have traditionally come from the area north of the Salmon River, which is the heart of the mining-timber area. And here was a woman, from the heart of the irrigated-farming area, seeking to represent the lumber and mining interests of a State which included such vast enterprises as the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, one of the greatest silver-lead producers in the Nation.

GRACIE FROST calmly set out on her campaign, knowing that she would not be able to shake the hands of all the 100,000 eligible voters on the isolated farms along the Lemhi, in the forest camps of the Sawtooths, or the mining camps along the Lochsa, all in her district, but determined to give it a try. She concentrated her efforts in north Idaho, the region where all believed that she would be weak. She visited the lumber camps, conferred with union officials and others in the mining camps. Five and ten persons in isolated communities back in the mountain areas on a dirt road beside some mountain stream were apt to find themselves shaking hands with a candidate for Congress.

"Covering" the First District in a campaign was an undertaking which made strong men shudder at the prospect, and yet the smiling, friendly, redhead fought for votes where it counted—at the level of the voters themselves—and did a more thorough job than had ever before been done. In the general election, she was defeated by a small margin. But her defeat came not in the northern counties where she had staged her battle, but in the counties closer to her home, where she believed her friends could carry the burden.

Characteristically, Gracie took her defeat in good humor. "Guess I should have spent more time at home," she said, "but, good gosh, I couldn't be home and up there, too."

She settled down in the real-estate business in her home town of Nampa—a city of 16,000. There was little question that she would try again, although she says that she was needed by her husband, Jack, into seeking election in 1952.

Once defeated, the comely redhead was no longer considered invulnerable by her opponents in 1952, they threw all their weight against her along the entire line from Snake River to the Canadian border. Her opponent, Dr. John T. Wood, was the same man who had defeated her in 1950.

Gracie just worked a little harder. Midway in the campaign she was talking in a husky voice a couple of octaves below her normally soft and quite deep speaking voice and certainly a number of degrees harsher. By election time, she was whispering hoarsely.

But her assurances were accepted. In a State which elected Republicans to all congressional positions but one, and which elected Republicans to all major State offices but one, GRACIE FROST, a Democrat, went to Washington from the First District.

Mrs. FROST was born in Boone County, Ark., and was reared in the Boise Valley in which she has since resided. Her community activities have been legion since the days in which as deputy county clerk with a half dozen other young kindred spirits, as well as a few older heads, she formed the nucleus of the Democratic Party in Canyon County.

She was active in forming the Caldwell, Idaho, Soroptimist Club when she was county treasurer and served as its first president in 1946. That year, under her leadership, the club laid the foundation for the expansion of the Girl Scout movement in the county seat. The work was not accomplished entirely by delegation of authority. During her lunch hour, Gracie often was seen doing a job of selling the organization's principles to a businessman, a store clerk, a father—anyone who seemed to have a moment on his hands—with missionary-like zeal. She served also as regional treasurer for the Soroptimists.

The pioneers who settled in the small valleys that dot her district, or who prospected in the mountains had only the forces of nature to conquer. Gracie, who spends an average of 16 hours a day on the job, would have found in pioneering a gentle, back-to-earth restfulness had she had an opportunity for a spell of it during the heights of her political campaigning last fall. It was a real uphill battle for reelection, but she won.

Her vivaciousness and enthusiasm left no doubt in the minds of her listeners that the Congresswoman from the Idaho First District was a public servant, and enjoying every moment of it.

Amendment to Section 406 of the Federal Seed Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act.

The purpose of this proposed amendment to one of the penalty provisions of the Federal Seed Act is intended to remove the stigma of having petty and unknowing violations of the Federal Seed Act by reputable businessmen in the seed industry being classified as criminal violations.

This amendment will enable the Government to hereafter have the option to bring civil proceedings for violations of the Federal Seed Act in addition to criminal actions. In civil proceedings the Government will not have to prove intent, but in criminal actions to know-

ingly violate the provisions of the act will be a factor in determining the violator's guilt.

Surplus Wheat and Corn Processed Into Flour and Meal Should Be Made Available to the Unemployed of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee in support of Senate bill 661 which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process wheat into flour and corn into meal for distribution to the unemployed and their families. S. 661 is similar to a bill I introduced on

the subject in the House of Representatives.

My statement before the Senate subcommittee follows:

Mr. Chairman, S. 661 is similar to H. R. 2851 with the exception of amendments adopted by the House Committee on Agriculture. I introduced similar legislation in the House because the subject of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal is of great interest to the unemployed people in my congressional district who can use surplus commodities to better advantage. If they are processed as provided for by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time over 18 percent of the civilian labor force in my congressional district is unemployed and is principally composed of coal miners and railroaders who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, liquidated their savings accounts, borrowed on or have taken the cash value of their insurance policies and today are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

To give you some idea of the overall picture of unemployment in my congressional district, let me call your attention to the following chart that describes the number of families and persons receiving surplus commodities:

Surplus commodities

County	Number o. families	Percentage of all families	Total number of persons	Percentage of county population
Blair.....	10,801	26.8	32,561	23.3
Centre.....	2,939	15.9	9,362	14.2
Clearfield.....	9,988	42.2	37,179	43.3
Total.....	23,728	28.8	79,402	27.1
Entire State of Pennsylvania.....			1,020,963	19.7

¹ Percent of State population of 10,498,012.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, before you receive coupons for surplus commodities you have to be certified as eligible by a local welfare agency.

Therefore, these figures are official and have been verified not only by the State of Pennsylvania but also by the county commissioners in each of the three counties in my congressional district.

Surplus commodities by carload lots to Mar. 1, 1955

County	Beans	Beef	Butter	Cheese	Dried milk	Rice	Short- ening
Blair.....	2	16	21	19	18	1	16
Centre.....	1/2	4	3	5	5	1/2	4
Clearfield.....	4	5	16	14	16	1	13
Total number of carloads.....	6 1/2	25	40	38	39	2 1/2	33
Grand total.....			184				

Mr. Chairman, there is no denial of the fact that these figures are startling and are an answer to those who smugly insist that there is no acute unemployment problem in the labor-surplus areas of the Nation.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, according to the Pennsylvania department of property and supplies, in this great industrial State of Pennsylvania, out of its 10 1/2 million residents, nearly 10 percent, or 1,020,963 are living on surplus commodities.

In this congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, out of a population of 292,000, nearly 28 percent or 79,402 persons are receiving surplus commodities.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are startling for they truly portray the extent of unemployment in my congressional district as well as in the entire State of Pennsylvania.

As I said in the beginning of this statement, the processing of wheat into flour and corn into meal will enable the families of the unemployed to use these surplus commodities to good advantage since many housewives still bake their own bread and muffins

and can put the flour and meal to good use in arranging the family diet.

Mr. Chairman, this idea of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal as provided for in S. 661 will not establish a precedent in the handling and distribution of surplus commodities, because over a period of years the United States Department of Agriculture has been distributing canned beef and gravy in processed form.

According to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, during the period from March to December of 1953, they purchased nearly 172 million pounds of canned beef and gravy for distribution here in the United States, while nearly 12 million more pounds of canned beef and gravy were purchased for export, mainly to Greece and Germany. The cost of these purchases was in excess of \$72 million.

Mr. Chairman, if it has been possible to put beef and gravy in a tin container for distribution, I can see no reason why wheat and corn should not be processed into flour and meal for the unemployed of the Nation. Therefore, I hope that S. 661 will receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

Dentists and Their Families Can Profit Greatly by Inclusion in Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter in the Record which I have written. A new group has been formed to undertake what I consider a very worthwhile cause. The cause is the inclusion of all self-employed dentists throughout the United States in social-security coverage starting in 1955. Being a member of the House Ways and Means Committee who has devoted many years of study and thought to the inclusion of self-employed professionals in the system, I am fully in accord with this effort. The group is the Congress of American Dentists for OASI. The following letter, addressed to the president of the group, I think fully expresses my views on the importance of the goal they are trying to achieve:

MAY 9, 1955.

J. GARRETT REILLY, D. D. S.,

President, Congress of American Dentists
for OASI, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. REILLY: I am extremely pleased that the Congress of American Dentists for OASI has been founded and is prepared to work on a nationwide basis to help get social security for the self-employed members of your important profession.

Now that you have organized to accomplish this worthwhile objective, I would like to point out that your group has no time to lose if the dentists of this Nation—approximately 75,000 strong—expect to receive coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system without being penalized.

Let me explain what I mean by this word "penalized."

Social-security benefits are calculated on the average wage received by a worker from January 1, 1951, until he reaches the age of retirement. However, the law provides that a worker, in making this calculation, may drop out his 4 years of lowest earnings.

Zero earnings under covered employment, of course, will pull down his average wage.

Other professional groups first brought into the system this year will not be penalized because they can drop out the 4 years, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

However, if dentists were not included until after April 15, 1956, they would have zero earnings for 1955 to pull their average wage down. For example, one whose wage computation is based on the maximum \$4,200 for 4 years but must include a year of zero earnings has an average wage for the 5 years of \$3,560, instead of having benefit entitlement figured on \$4,200 for the period.

But, as the self-employed only pay their social-security tax for 1955 when they pay their income tax on April 15, 1956, if dentists are brought into the system before that date and pay their 1955 social-security tax then, they would have no years of zero earnings on their record and, as a result, would get the maximum social-security benefits if they earn \$4,200 a year.

Important too is the fact that, under the social-security system, those nearing the age of 65 will be entitled to coverage if they are in the program half the time between 1951 and the date they reach the age of 65 (after using the drop out) with a minimum necessary coverage of 6 quarters (18 months).

Therefore, the sooner those nearing retirement age can join the system the better for them.

In the past some associations have opposed dentists entering the social-security system largely on the theory that many dentists never retire and, therefore, would not receive the old-age-retirement benefits themselves.

Of course, we know that a good many dentists, men whose work is very delicate and who almost always must stand on their feet, do retire at or about the age of 65. However, even if the old argument of some of the organizations was true, we must face the fact that, unfortunately, some dentists do die leaving widows and minor children and some dentists are forced to retire because of ill health.

If my bill, H. R. 6049, to include dentists becomes law what can social security mean to the self-employed dentist and his family? If self-employed dentists are given coverage, a dentist who has an average net income of \$4,200 a year, or more, and who has a wife and two children, would have protection for them if he died in the amount of \$200 a month tax free until the older child reached the age of 18. At that time, the monthly benefit would drop to \$162.80 a month until the younger child reaches the age of 18. After that there would be no benefits until the widow reached that age of 65 when her benefits would be resumed at the rate of \$81.40 a month unless she remarried.

If the children were age 6 and 4, these payments would amount to \$32,000 assuming that the mother and children live until the younger child reaches the age of 18.

The widow, if she lives to age 65 would then have a life expectancy of 14 or more years and her benefits, in addition to the above mentioned \$32,000, would be in excess of \$13,000.

It should be mentioned in this connection that the social-security system would also provide a maximum lump-sum payment of \$255 to cover funeral expenses.

An income of \$81.40 a month is equivalent to \$976 a year. It would take \$32,500 of accumulated capital invested in Government bonds at 3 percent to produce an annual income of \$976.

I will also mention the benefits available to dentists upon retirement. If a dentist should retire after the age of 65 and had earned an average of \$4,200 a year, he would receive a monthly tax-free income of \$108.50 which would be increased to \$162.80 when his wife also reaches the age of 65. At the age of 72 old-age-insurance benefits would be paid to him as an outright annuity.

In addition, the law provides for a waiver of premium for a person who becomes totally disabled before age 65. Because of this protection, a disabled individual can qualify for full benefits at 65 even though full contributions have not been paid.

For all of this protection the dentist with a net income of \$4,200 or more a year would pay premiums of \$126 annually. The premium would rise by a series of steps beginning in 1960 to a maximum premium—beginning with the year 1975—of \$252 annually.

Many dentists have already received social-security credits. Among these are those who have served in the Armed Forces, dentists employed in medical departments of business and industry, those employed on hospital staffs, laboratories, and clinics operated for a profit, and many of those employed by educational institutions and other non-profit groups. Under the present law, however, self-employed dentists have little opportunity to participate in the program and maintain an insured status.

With the present high income-tax rates, it is difficult for any individual to set aside substantial savings for his dependents. This, of course, is particularly true for those with moderate incomes. The young dentist starting his private practice usually has high

expenses and heavy family obligations at a time when his income is relatively low. Death of the young dentist at this time is a real hardship on his widow and children and social-security payments might be the one thing which could keep the family together.

It is difficult to have a comprehensive and fair social-security system with some individuals covered and some individuals not covered. I believe that self-employed dentists, if fully informed, would generally favor coverage. However, knowing the deep respect Congress holds for dentists I realize that persuading that legislative body to include you will continue to be difficult unless representative groups of dentists favor inclusion. Possibly the Congress of American Dentists for OASI of which you are president will aid in starting the necessary movement.

I do feel that the plan that you outlined to me of urging all of the dentists in the United States to record their views, pro or con, about inclusion in the OASI system by mailing a postcard to you at the above address is excellent. This expression of opinion, if those dentists sign their names and addresses on the postcard could make a sales-worthy exhibit to offer the Congress as sure proof that the great majority of dentists want social security.

Another thing to remember is that Members of Congress, when they go home for adjournment often visit their dentists for a checkup. Dentists interested in social security can greatly advance their cause by expressing their views on social security to their Congressmen at that time.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT W. KEAN,
Member of Congress, 12th District,
New Jersey.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the 7 counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 22 and 23, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 24 and 25, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 26 and 27, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 29 and 30, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 31 and September 1, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 2 and 3, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 6 and 7, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

The Asian-African Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly the Asian-African Conference that took place in Bandung, Indonesia, on April 18-24 last. It is important that its implications as they affect the United States and the free world be carefully studied by us. We belong to the legislative branch of our Government and many of our decisions have a direct bearing on what will result from the decisions made at Bandung.

It should be a matter of gratification for us that when 29 nations of Asia and Africa met, the world found out that democracy is strongly entrenched in that area; that despite the efforts of neutralists and Communists to slant the Conference against the free world, those who believe in freedom asserted themselves and succeeded in defeating all attempts to make of the Conference a sounding board for neutralism and communism.

That we did not suspect this unexpected strength of democracy in Asia and Africa is a lesson we should remember. It shows that we have more friends than we know. In not knowing that we have such stalwart allies we are guilty of either indifference or neglect, and this we should correct at once. This is the first moral that we should draw from the Bandung meeting.

The second lesson is to be drawn from the fact that in Bandung the conferees exercised restraint of the highest order. Their utterances and decisions showed dignity and sobriety. No attacks were made based on racism. Where we feared the color line would be drawn because of the manner the participating countries were selected, nothing in the proceedings of the Conference showed that any of the delegates were animated by racism. Asia and Africa, through their delegates, extended to us the hand of friendship and good will. We should, in equal reciprocity, grasp that hand of

friendship and good will. Here is where we can together lay the groundwork for peace for all mankind.

The third lesson is that we should not be too hasty in judging the motives and purposes of other nations. When the Conference was first announced, it was with misgivings that the convening of the meeting was received. Many fears were expressed. As a result, our Government, through President Eisenhower, failed to send a message of greetings to the Conference. This is unfortunate. We should have been the first ones to welcome the Conference and to send our official greetings to the conferees, the majority of whom turned out to be our best friends and allies. Here the State Department failed us in not giving our Government the correct intelligence and background information.

The fourth lesson is that as Ernest Lindley in his column in *Newsweek* aptly said, we cannot discount the Asians who in the Conference showed they have statesmen and diplomats of the highest caliber, seasoned and mature, who can match the best of Europe and America. Among these I wish to single out a former Member of this House, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the Philippines' chief delegate in the Bandung Conference. All the press dispatches were unanimous in acclaiming him as the leader of the democratic forces in the Conference. The Filipino people should be proud that in a meeting of 29 Asian and African nations it was a Filipino voice that spoke for democracy so effectively that the whole world listened.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record General Romulo's speech that will go down in history as a classic that turned the tide for the free world in Bandung:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CARLOS P. ROMULO, MEMBER OF THE CABINET, CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE, BANDUNG, INDONESIA

I am proud to bring to this Conference the greetings of the President and people of the Republic of the Philippines.

We of the Philippines have a profound sense of the great historic events dramatized by this unique gathering; we were, may I remind you, the first of the new nations to emerge in the great rearrangement of the world which began after the end of the Second World War. Our Republic came to being, freely and peacefully, on July 4, 1946. Since that time we have watched with proud solidarity and a feeling of oneness the establishment of the other independent nations of a free Asia, so old and yet so new. We have in these 9 years taken our stand firmly behind the struggle of every people to become master of its own fate, to enjoy its own identity, to be responsible for its own acts, to join in the immense task of building a new structure of human well-being and free institutions, the task, indeed, of changing the face of the world. To the peoples of Africa, already setting forth on this same path, we pledge our friendship and all the moral and practical support within our power to give as they join us of Asia in the great universal effort to better man's estate.

We come as members of one great family long separated from each other. In this family reunion we are here to talk of man's estate. But I do not think it will serve us well to have come here from our many corners of the earth to shroud the truth about man's estate in platitudes, propaganda, or

easy self-deception. The world is too harsh a place for this, our problems too great, too perilous, too complicated to allow us this luxury. This conference will justify itself if we share our views frankly and realistically as brothers should. We will serve each other if we examine ourselves, if we state the issues and problems plainly as we see them, if we clarify, as far as we can, our needs, our choices, our goals—and our obstacles. Let us seek a true meeting of minds on those we share in common and where there are differences, let us try at least to understand them.

All who are represented here are certainly concerned with the issues of (1) colonialism and political freedom, (2) racial equality, and (3) peaceful economic growth. The history of the world in our time turns on the ways in which these issues are met and resolved, or not met and not resolved. We are part, all of us, of a time of great transformation, for each of us and for all the people on earth. It is a trying, difficult, dangerous time—but with it all a good time to be living in. Never before, surely, have so many people been consciously a part of the history through which they were living. We in this room are, for our brief moment, a part of this history. How do we see it? How do we understand it?

To begin with, the very fact that we have come together here in this manner illustrates the great new fact that these issues of freedom, equality, and growth are no longer merely national problems but world problems. Indeed, the United Nations was created as an attempt to grapple with this great new fact. In one sense, this conference suggests that for the peoples of Asia and Africa the United Nations has inadequately met the need for establishing common ground for peoples seeking peaceful change and development. But I think we must also say that if the United Nations has been weak and limited in its progress toward these goals, it is because the United Nations is still much more a mirror of the world than an effective instrument for changing it. It has been in existence only 9 years, and through that time always subject to all the pressures and difficulties of national rivalries and power conflicts, large and small. It is a place where man, not quite yet a reasonable animal, is trying very hard to become one.

We do not have to be satisfied with the rate of progress being made. But neither can we be blind to the great changes that have taken place in so short a time. The world is a very different place from what it was a scant 15 years ago, and hence the United Nations is a very different body from the old League of Nations. A primary difference is the presence of the new spokesmen for Asian and African peoples who never allow the Western representatives to forget that the United Nations Charter pledged the freedom and self-determination of all peoples and that there are peoples in Asia and Africa who take that pledge with literal seriousness, and who will not rest until it is redeemed.

The majority of independent nations represented here won their independence only within the last decade. Who would have been bold enough, 20 years ago, to predict that this would be so? Who will be bold enough now to say how soon or how slowly those peoples in Africa strong enough to win it will acquire the right to face their own problems in their own way on their own responsibility? The handwriting of history is spread on the wall: But not everybody reads it the same way or interprets similarly what he reads there. We know the age of European empire is at an end; not all Europeans know that yet. Not all Asians or Africans have been or are still aware that they must make themselves the conscious instruments of historic change.

Political freedom has been won by many different means. The British surrendered

power in southern Asia because they knew they could no longer maintain it and were wise enough to base their action on reality. The French and Dutch had to be forced to the same conclusion. The United States has at times appeared to us lacking in consistency and vigor in upholding the right of non-self-governing peoples to independence. It has on some issues leaned heavily in favor of colonial powers and has sometimes disheartened us because of its failure to make its actions dovetail with its ideals of equality and freedom. We think that this was more than regrettable; we think it has been unwise. Let it be stated in fairness however that uniquely among the colonial powers the United States in our case made a formal pledge of independence, fixed a date for it 10 years in advance, and fully and honorably redeemed that pledge. True, we fought ceaselessly for our freedom and never gave up our struggle and we earned it when it came. But we of the Philippines have directly experienced the basic good faith of the United States in our own relationship and we feel that the principles upon which it was based will ultimately prevail.

It is to be hoped, however, that this conference will help remind all the Western powers that the issue of political independence for subject peoples does not depend on their goodwill or slow access of wisdom or virtue. The age of empire is being helped into oblivion by the aroused will and action of people determined to be masters of their own fate. Those of us here who have already won our independence were only the initiators of this process. All the others, almost all now in Africa, stand at various points along their own roads to full self-determination. There is much, of course, one cannot readily foresee. But everything we know and understand about history assures us that whatever new travails the future holds, the old structure of Western empire will and must pass from the scene. Will it expire quietly and in dignity? Will it go out crashing violently? That will depend on many things. But the end is not in doubt.

There are at least three things more to be said here about this matter of national political freedom:

First, it is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact. Because it expresses the deepest desires of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a façade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection. I know that on this score there are violently different opinions in the world. I can recall how new nations like India, Indonesia, and Ceylon were called puppets of imperialism when they were newly born to freedom. And of course, the Philippine Republic has been described by these same sources as a mere tool of the United States. On the other hand, there is the way some of us view the position of certain other countries which from our own perspective we consider as subservient to other powers. I wonder if in such countries you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open criticism and other attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence? I wonder if any of the spokesmen of these countries would ever speak as freely in criticism of the bigger country to which they feel friendly or allied as, say, we in the Philippines speak our minds about the United States? I am sure you will forgive my frankness, but in this land of the ingenious and artistic *wajang*, of the wonderful Indonesian shadow play and puppet shows, I think we ought to say plainly to each other when we think a puppet is a puppet.

Secondly, is political freedom achieved when the national banner rises over the seat

of government, the foreign ruler goes, and the power passes into the hands of our own leaders? Is the struggle for national independence the struggle to substitute a local oligarchy for the foreign oligarchy? Or is it just the beginning of the conquest of real freedom by the people of the land? Is there political freedom where only one political party may rule? Is there political freedom where dissent from the policy of the government means imprisonment or worse? It strikes me that autocratic rule, control of the press, and the police state are exactly the worst features of some colonialist systems against which we have fought all our lives and against which so many of us are still fighting. Is this really the model of the freedom we seek? Or is it the free interplay of contending parties, the open competition of ideas and political views in the market place, the freedom of a man to speak up as he chooses, be he right or wrong? I know there are many possible answers to these questions. But for my part and for my people, may I say plainly that we regard the struggle for freedom as an unending, constant, unrelenting demand upon us, that with all our acknowledged failings, faults, and weaknesses, we are seeking to build in our land a society in which the freedom of our Republic will truly become the freedom of every one of its citizens.

Finally, in this world of contending great powers, the independence of the small or weak nation is at best a precarious and fragile thing. Obviously, the ultimate greater freedom will lie in a greater coherence, a uniting of regional interests, in the creation of counterbalancing moral, economic, and physical strength, in the greatest possible common action by all to avert the disaster of a new world war. Let us face squarely up to the fact that within the Nation we can regain our self-respect and grapple with our local problems but that for the primary goals of economic transformation and well-being and peace, the Nation no longer suffices. Western European man today is paying the terrible price for preserving too long the narrow and inadequate instrument of the nation state. We of Asia and Africa are emerging into this world as new nation states in an epoch when nationalism, as such, can solve only the least of our problems and leaves us powerless to meet the more serious ones. We have to try to avoid repeating all of Europe's historic errors. We have to have the imagination and courage to put ourselves in the forefront of the attempt to create a 20th-century world based on the true interdependence of peoples.

I have said that besides the issues of colonialism and political freedom, all of us here are concerned with the matter of racial equality. This is a touchstone, I think, for most of us assembled here and the peoples we represent. The systems and the manners of it have varied, but there has not been and there is not a Western colonial regime, which has not imposed, to a greater or lesser degree, on the people it ruled, the doctrine of their own racial inferiority. We have known, and some of us still know, the searing experience of being demeaned in our own lands, of being systematically relegated to subject status not only politically and economically, and militarily—but racially as well. Here was a stigma that could be applied to rich and poor alike, to prince and slave, boss man and workingman, landlord and peasant, scholar and ignoramus. To bolster his rule, to justify his own power to himself, Western white man assumed that his superiority lay in his very genes, in the color of his skin. This made the lowliest drunken sot superior, in colonial society, to the highest product of culture and scholarship and industry among the subject people.

I do not think in this company I have to labor the full import of this pernicious doctrine and practice. I do not think I have to try to measure the role played by this

racism as a driving force in the development of the nationalist movements in our many lands. For many it has made the goal of regaining a status of simple manhood the be-all and end-all of a lifetime of devoted struggle and sacrifice.

Today this type of Western racism survives in virulent form only in certain parts of Africa, notably in the Union of South Africa, but certainly in many other places as well on that vast continent. Against this every decent man on earth has to set his face. In the United Nations the Asian and African states have again and again forced this issue on the unwilling attention of the other members. There we could see palpably the extent to which Western men have had to become defensive about their past racist attitudes. Few of the Western countries were willing to go far enough in condemning the racial practices of the Government of the Union of South Africa. They have yet to learn, it seems, how deeply this issue cuts and how profoundly it unites non-Western peoples who may disagree on all sorts of questions. Again, we can only hope that this Conference serves as a sober and yet jolting reminder to them that the day of Western racism is passing along with the day of Western power over non-Western peoples. Its survival in any form can only hang like an albatross around the necks of those many people in the West who sincerely seek to build a freer and better world.

No less than this can be said. But there is something more, too. It is one of our heaviest responsibilities, we of Asia and Africa, not to fall ourselves into the racist trap. We will do this if we let ourselves be drawn insensibly—or deliberately—into any kind of counterracism, if we respond to the white man's prejudice against us as nonwhites with prejudice against whites simply because they are white. What a triumph this would be for racism if it should come about. How completely we would defeat ourselves and all who have ever struggled in our countries to be free. There is no more dangerous or immoral or absurd idea than the idea of any kind of policy or grouping based on color or race as such. This would, in the deepest sense, mean giving up all hope of human freedom in our time. I think that over the generations the deepest source of our own confidence in ourselves had to come from the deeply rooted knowledge that the white man was wrong; that in proclaiming the superiority of his race, qua race, he stamped himself with his own weakness and confirmed all the rest of us in our dogged conviction that we could and would reassert ourselves as men.

Our quarrel with racism is that it substitutes the accident of skin color for judgment of men as men. Counterracism would have us do the same; to lump white men by their supposed racial grouping and govern our acts and reactions accordingly. It is our task to rise above this noxious nonsense. We have the responsibility to remain aware that this kind of racist attitude has been the practice, not of all white men but only of some, that it flies in the face of their own profoundest religious beliefs and political goals and aspirations, that in almost all Western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all its manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously.

We have the responsibility to acknowledge more than this; this business of racism, or other things like it, is an outcropping of one of many human weaknesses that we all share. The racism of Western white man has played an especially prominent role in history because the Western man associated it with the establishment of his great power over so many non-Western peoples. As such, it deserves the special and prominent place it must have in the thinking and feeling of everyone. But we must also soberly ask our-

selves: Is there a single society or culture represented in this Conference which does not in some degree have its counterpart of this kind of prejudice and ignorance? Where is the society in which men have not in some manner divided themselves for political, social, and economic purposes, by wholly irrational and indefensible categories of status, birth, and yes, even skin color? It was a major part of the greatness of India's immortal leader Mahatma Gandhi, that he devoted so much of his fruitful life of selflessness and sacrifice to a struggle against precisely this kind of thing in Indian life. Would that we all gave as much time to the mote in our own eye as we give to denouncing the beam in the eye of another.

Surely we are entitled to our resentment and rejection of white racism wherever it exists. But we are also called upon, as honest men who want to better man's estate wherever and whatever he is, to acknowledge that in degree we all suffer from the same sin of ignorance and immorality. I ask you to remember that just as Western political thought has given us all so many of our basic ideas of political freedom, justice, and equity, it is Western science which in this generation has exploded the mythology of race. Let us not preserve stupid racial superstitions which belong to the past. Let us work to remove this ugly disease wherever it is rooted, whether it be among Western men or among ourselves.

Lastly, I have said that all of us here are concerned with peaceful economic growth. This brings us closest of all to the hub, the center, the heart of our common preoccupations, because the political forms and methods we seek and choose, the social ideas and ideals we embrace, are all wrapped up in the way in which we strive for growth. Economic growth, economic change, transformation of our backward and inadequate economies—these we all seek. These we must seek, else we stagnate and die. After all, it is precisely because the billion and a half people of Asia and Africa have begun in our time to strive for a better economic stake in life that most of us are here today. This is the great new overwhelming fact of this century. The way in which this is achieved will fix the shape of history for all future men.

We all confront the staggering facts of our economic backwardness. This has been partly due to factors of climate, geography, and the stubborn survival of obsolete social patterns. But it has also in large measure and perhaps decisively been the result of patterns imposed upon us by Western colonialism. This heritage is the heaviest burden we carry with us into the new epoch of national freedom. The great masses of our people live in a state of rural poverty. We need to diversify our economies. We need to industrialize in accordance with our resources and needs. We have to win a more balanced place in the market places of the world. We have to do this in a manner that will effectively raise the standard of living of our people. These are the things we have fought for. These are the things that some of us here are still fighting for. For these things above all, we have needed to be free to seek our own way.

But let us not have too many illusions about national independence. We arrive in the world as nations in the middle of the 20th century, not the 19th or the 18th. We have to strive to become nations in a time when history has already passed from the nation to larger units of economic and social coherence: the region, the continent, the world. It is a world as envisioned by Rabindranath Tagore, "not divided into fragments by narrow domestic walls . . ." The idea of national self-sufficiency served the Western World only for a short time as a means to effective growth. Indeed, the great travail of the Western World, its conflicts, rivalries, and wars have derived in

no small degree from the fact that the nation, as such, has outlived its usefulness as an instrument of progress. Not even the great powers of today can stand alone, much less newly emergent states weak in everything but the will to grow. In this 20th century world the sober fact is that a purely national economy is an illusion. We cannot start where, say, England started two centuries ago. We have to make our places in a world that has already made tremendous advances technologically and where economic interdependence has become the key to effective economic development and growth.

Considering the present state of the world, with its profound conflicts and insecurities, this may be viewed by some as a crippling disadvantage. But in a very real sense, and a more hopeful sense, it is rather an advantage if we can but grasp it. It means that we need not go through the equivalent of the decades and centuries of ugly, painful, and costly development which occurred in most Western countries. It means that if circumstances favor it, we can make use of the most ultramodern technologies to transform ourselves more rapidly, to make new and hitherto unforeseen use of our resources. Who knows yet what the new potentialities of nuclear power are going to mean for Asia and Africa? It is obvious that the real world we live in does not at this moment offer much promise of any early opportunity to find out. But here we have one of the real stakes we all share in preserving the peace, in creating international instruments which will put men to work for man's growth instead of his destruction.

Our fate is bound up with the fate of the whole world. National isolation, in any real sense, is an impossibility in our time, whether we think of an ideal world uniting its human and natural resources for the well-being of all, or the real world, deeply divided and groping its way to decisions that will in one way or another affect every person on earth. The fact is that we will need greater world coherence than we have now if we are to thrive. The fact is that the effective mobilization of world capital and resources will be absolutely vital to us in the process of mobilizing our own capital and our own resources. The fact is that these things will depend in great measure on the further course of the conflicts that now govern all world affairs. It is pure illusion to think that we can be independent of these big facts.

But this by no means leaves us helpless to act in our own interest. It does not mean that we have no choice but to leave the great decisions to others. Quite the contrary. Quite the contrary, because it is precisely in our lands, in our continents, that the most important decisions are going to be made. And it is we who will make them, by what we do or by what we do not do in the coming years.

It could be that Russia's bombs or America's bombs will determine the future shape of the world and the fate of humanity. If it comes to that the tragedy will be total: it will make all we say or do here or anywhere else quite irrelevant. Reason will die and the survivors will move as best they can into a new epoch of savagery. But I do not think the great decisions will come that way. I think the shape of the world is going to be determined in large measure by the way in which the peoples of Asia and Africa go about the business of transforming their lives and their societies.

What do we want? How do we propose to seek it? These are the questions on which the fate of the world really turns. In not fully understanding this, many in the Western World commit their most tragic blunder. For our part, we of Asia and Africa have to face up squarely to the big choices that lie before us. We have to try to understand as clearly as we can exactly what they mean.

There are certain things in all our minds on this matter. We all want to the best of our power and wisdom to seek change in terms of the genius of our own various cultures and histories. We all want no more foreign exploitation of our wealth for the benefit of foreign interests. We do not want our future development to turn out to be another alien graft on our lives. We want this development to raise the physical and educational standards of our peoples. What roads lead to these ends? How do we begin to face up to these vast and formidable tasks?

There is no magic wand or automatic formula to bring about social and economic change. It means that we have to assume our own heavy responsibilities. It means mobilizing people, mobilizing resources. It means great toil, flexibility, adaptability, intelligence. But it also means defining our goal. Is our goal just so many new industries or factories, new dams or bridges or transportation systems? Or is our goal the betterment and the greater freedom, through these and other things, of the lives of the people?

This is no simple rhetorical question. Wrapped up in it are all the troubled issues of our time. And because according to the joint communique of the Bogor Conference "the basic purpose of this Conference is that the countries concerned should become better acquainted with one another's point of view," may I outline for you our views on the possible choices open to us.

There is one road to change which some countries have adopted and which offer itself to the rest of us as a possible choice. This is the road which proposes total change through total power, through avowed dictatorship and the forcible manipulation of men and means to achieve certain ends, the rigid control of all thought and expression, the ruthless suppression of all opposition, the pervasive control of human life in all spheres by a single, tightly run, self-selected organization of elite individuals. I know that an elaborate series of phrases and rationalization are often used to describe this system. But I am concerned not with propaganda myths. I am concerned with realities. I think we all have to be concerned with what this system offers and what it means.

Does the road to greater freedom really lie through an indefinite period of less freedom? Is it for this that we have in this generation raised our heads and taken up the struggle against foreign tyrannies?

Has all the sacrifice, struggle, and devotion, all been, then, for the purpose of replacing foreign tyranny by domestic tyranny?

Do we fight to regain our manhood from Western colonial rulers only to surrender it to rulers among ourselves who seize the power to keep us enslaved?

Is it true, can it be true, in this vastly developed 20th century, that national progress must be paid for with the individual well-being and freedom of millions of people? Can we really believe that this price will, in some dim and undefined future time, be redeemed by the well-being and freedom of the yet unborn?

The philosophers of this system have answered this question through their doctrine of the so-called withering away of the state. But the rulers who have established their power in real life and not in the realm of bookish dreams have abandoned this tenet of their faith. We have had ample opportunity to witness over more than a generation now that this kind of power, once established, roots itself more and more deeply, gets more and more committed to perpetuating itself. Moreover, and the whole logic of human experience throws its weight into the scale, this system of power becomes inherently expansionist. It cannot accept the premise of peace with opponents

outside its borders any more than it can make peace with opponents inside its borders. It seeks and must seek to crush all opposition, wherever it exists.

This road is open before many of us. The gateway to it is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clangs behind you. The policeman becomes master and your duty thereafter is forever to say aye. Even those who enjoy the role of mastery must know that this system devours its own.

No, my friends, I don't think we have come to where we are, only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower. We do not want leaderships in our countries subservient to foreign rulers, be they in London or Paris, The Hague, or Washington, or, we must add, Moscow. I think our peoples want to worship the Almighty and live in accordance with His laws, to better their lot, to educate themselves and their children, raise themselves from the degradation of want and disease and misery, by holding up their own heads and acting freely to achieve these great and difficult aims by their own free means in partnership with similarly dedicated people everywhere in the world.

That is the freedom of the democratic way of life. That is the freedom we want all the peoples of Asia and Africa to enjoy. That is the freedom that President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines had in mind when he authored the Pacific Charter which enshrines the dignity of man, his well-being, his security, his progress, his nation's right to self-determination. The Philippine delegation is here not only to reiterate the ideals of that charter but to underscore in this conference that it is the sense of the Filipino people that such right of self-determination includes the right of nations to decide exclusively by themselves their ability to assume the responsibilities inherent in an independent political status. This is the time for Asia and Africa to reassert this principle and serve notice to the world that only by its unqualified acceptance by everyone can there be peace and justice for all mankind.

The success of this Conference will be measured not only by what we do for ourselves but also by what we do for the entire human community. Large as is the cause of Asia, there is a cause even larger. It is the cause of the human family in a world struggling to liberate itself from the chaos of international anarchy. In short, our cause is the cause of man. If the voice coming out of this Conference speaks for Asia and Africa alone, the words will have energy and force but they will make no claim on history. But if our voice speaks for man—man as world citizen rather than world warrior—then we can return to our peoples with the knowledge that we have served them as they need most to be served.

Fellow delegates, our strength flows not out of our number though the numbers we represent are great. It flows out of our perception of history and out of vital purpose for tomorrow. If that purpose is stained by resentment or desire for revenge then this Conference will be a fragile and forgetful thing. Let us, therefore, draw strength not from the hurts of past or present but from our common hopes—hopes that can come to life in all peoples everywhere. And if the test of that strength should be our ability to forgive, then let it be said that we were the giants of our time.

Let us invoke the blessing and the guidance of Almighty God over our deliberations so that this Conference may prove to be the radiating center of the divine injunction "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and we may help to make the East and West live together as enjoined by our ancient Asian creed, "We are all brothers under the canopy of heaven."

We Question George Humphrey's Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following text of a splendid speech made by our colleague, the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner of the Young Democratic Club of York, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23:

ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY AND TAX POLICIES OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY GEORGE HUMPHREY

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Member of Congress)

It is difficult to find or establish a frame of reference for criticism of the present administration. Even before President Eisenhower was elected, it was stated by one of his chief supporters, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, that we should not expect him to have a clear stand on issues but anticipate that he would act on the basis of subconscious principles. We have since been assured that his appointments—Cabinet positions and others—are men of good will. If one questions program or policy, he is readily accused of questioning the integrity and the good intentions of these governmental officials. Mistakes do occur. Republican defenders say the President is not responsible because he was not informed. It was contended in a Washington newspaper recently that the "kitchen cabinet" should be held responsible. Apparently having excused the President, the current move is to excuse the Cabinet and to lay responsibility, if it is necessary to do so, on the third level of officials in the present administration.

I do not tonight intend to criticize the President, nor the third-level Government officials, nor even those in the second or Cabinet level who are not considered strong men or important influences on Government. I would like, however, to take up with you the record and the policies of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, who is generally accepted as being the strongest man in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The story of his appointment as the Secretary of the Treasury has, insofar as I know, never been fully reported. Politically he called himself a Taft man before the 1952 convention. He is reported to have worked in some manner, although there is no extensive public record, for the election of President Eisenhower. Again according to a report, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury on the recommendation of Gen. Lucius Clay. Whatever his background and whoever his supporters were, George Humphrey seemed quite ready to assume the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury. Apparently he almost immediately impressed President Eisenhower, who said, shortly after he took office, that "In Cabinet meetings I always wait for George Humphrey to speak. I sit back and listen to the others talk while he doesn't say anything. But I know that when he speaks up he will say just what I am thinking." If this is actually the case, it would seem quite unnecessary for George Humphrey to speak at all to the President unless the President preferred to have Humphrey tell the other Cabinet members what he, the President, was thinking rather than tell them himself.

The Secretary of the Treasury, as a man responsible largely for fiscal and economic policy of the United States, had when he took office, I assume, some sense of responsibility with regard to statements made by

Republicans in the course of the 1952 campaign. There were, of course, the regular, expected denunciations of taxes in general, promises of tax reduction, of balancing the budget, and reducing the national debt. Some Republicans spoke of imposing a 25-percent limitation on personal income taxes, charging that the graduated scale as it existed in the law was immoral. There were many Republicans who denounced the corporate profits tax and others who said that the excise taxes were iniquitous. They expressed general dissatisfaction with what their candidate called treadmill prosperity and spoke of stabilizing and at the same time expanding our economy. The Republican platform promised to "aid small business in every practicable way." "The Republican Party will create," the platform said, "conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability safeguarding the farmers independence and opening opportunities for young people in rural communities." These in general were the promises and the program with regard to Government finance and the American economy.

Let us look now to the performance. In the first 3 years of the present administration, there has been a budget deficit each year, and it is estimated that the deficit for fiscal 1956 will be approximately \$2½ billion. If this estimate is correct, the 4-year Republican administration will show an increase in the national debt from approximately \$259 billion at the end of fiscal 1952, to approximately \$276 billion at the end of fiscal 1956—an increase of approximately \$17 billion. The Republicans have attempted to distinguish between good and bad deficits—the standard being for the most part that a deficit occurring under a Democratic administration is a bad deficit, whereas one occurring under a Republican administration is a good deficit. A sharper distinction has been made by one observer who states the difference in these terms: That the Democrats spend more than they collect, whereas the Republicans collect less than they spend. Promises to give the country something other than treadmill prosperity have been partially fulfilled, but in a negative way. The gross national product declined by approximately \$7½ billion in 1954. Talk of 100 percent of parity for farmers in the market place does not stand up well in view of the present parity ratio of approximately 86. The fact that farm income is generally down and that the number of people living on farms is declining does not square very well with the Republican platform statement that it would create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability and that it would open opportunities for young people in rural communities. The rate of small business failures has increased.

Of course the Secretary of the Treasury is not entirely responsible for these developments any more than he would be entirely responsible if the level of prosperity had increased, if farm income were high, if unemployment were reduced. There are limits to what Government can do in the way of directing the American economy and fortunately, also, as result of the passage of legislation such as the social security program, the farm program, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, and similar legislation, limitations were placed upon the disastrous effects which the operation of an entirely free economy and unrestrained competition might have upon the domestic economy of the United States. Nonetheless, Government policy, particularly fiscal policy, does have an important bearing upon the economic welfare of the Nation.

Let us look at the record of the administration. Shortly after being established in the position of authority, the Secretary of the Treasury initiated what was called a hard-money policy. This hard-money policy essentially involved an increase in interest rates so that those who had to borrow money would be required to pay more to

those persons and institutions who were lending it. The tight-money policy has since been reversed or at least modified. The experiment, however, was expensive. For example, on one long-term Government bond issue, the Secretary of the Treasury set an interest of 3¼ percent, which was 30 percent higher than the previous rate of 2½ percent. This issue was extremely popular. It was oversubscribed by five times. The taxpayers of the country will pay in added interest on this bond issue alone over the life period of the bonds approximately \$200 million. Interest rates on other Government securities were also increased and the increased interest rate spread throughout the entire economy. Although the administration has had to retreat from its extreme position on interest rates, its general policy has been one of tightening the money market and increasing the cost of money to borrowers. There is evidence that the economy is recovering now, but, I think, there is no question but what it was staggered and seriously hurt by the hard-money policy.

In the field of taxation, the attitude of the administration, or at least of the Secretary of the Treasury, is becoming clear. There has been, of course, no general attack upon all taxation, as was indicated there might be in the campaign. The direction of the administration's tax policy is indicated in the administration's support of two major tax changes. First, in its support of the dividend exemption provision in the 1954 tax law, and in its more recent opposition to the \$20 income-tax credit proposed in the 84th Congress. The administration argued for the dividend exemption on the grounds that this would eliminate double taxation. It is significant to note, however, that at the same time the administration was asking for an extension of the regular corporate profits tax. I think it fair to ask the question as to why, if the administration was concerned about double taxation, it did not simply recommend that the corporate profits be reduced and the complicated provisions with regard to dividend exemptions not be injected into the tax program. This would have been the simple way to eliminate so-called double taxation. As a matter of fact, however, the corporate profits tax is to a large extent a regressive tax which falls upon the purchaser of the corporation's products or services—to a large extent, therefore, in the nature of a sales tax. Dividend exemption, however, gives tax advantage and tax relief to those who receive an income from investment. Seventy-six cents out of every dividend dollar are paid to the top 4 taxpayers out of every 100 taxpayers.

The Republican administration, led by the Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, was successful in defeating the \$20 income tax credit proposed by the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives in this session of Congress. The argument of the administration was that the condition of the Federal budget did not justify a reduction in taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury argued that this consideration was the primary one and that in view of the budget deficit the tax rates should not be reduced. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Republican tax reduction bill was under consideration in the 83d Congress, the administration in the face of a budget deficit of approximately \$4½ billion supported a bill which was expected to reduce revenue by approximately \$1½ billion. They then argued that revenue was not the important consideration, but that the economic effects of taxes were to be given primary consideration. Approximately 1 year later in anticipation of a deficit of \$2.5 billion, the administration opposed as unsound a reduction of approximately \$815 million in tax revenue arguing that economic considerations were of secondary importance.

On the basis of this record, I think that the following conclusion can safely be made. First, that one can expect no consistency in

the arguments of the administration on tax or economic questions. Second, that the administration is not as strongly opposed to the corporate profits tax as it has sometimes indicated, but is rather concerned about reducing taxes paid by people in the high income bracket, especially when that revenue is derived from investment in corporations. Third, that it is not as anxious as it claimed to be during the 1952 campaign to reduce excise taxes, although there has been little indication of late that the Secretary of the Treasury intends to press for consideration of a national sales tax. Their policy is not one of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, but rather one of overfeeding the goose.

Actually we should not be altogether surprised at the policies which have been adopted and supported by the administration. Examination of the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury indicate that he has acted about as we should have expected him to act and as we may expect him to act in the future. We should not, for example, be surprised that business failures in the \$5,000 to \$25,000 class increased by approximately 70 percent between 1953 and 1954. We should not be surprised to learn that the administration is inclined to favor in its defense contracts the larger corporations, for the Secretary of the Treasury has said that "America needs big business, it requires big businesses, big enterprises, to do the things in big ways that a big country has to have." I think that we would all agree that America does need big business, but that it also needs small business and businesses of medium size. We should not be altogether surprised that the administration's tax policies particularly have tended to favor investors, for the Secretary of the Treasury, testifying before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1954, said, "There is nothing more important for the future of America than to encourage widespread investment in American business." All of us would agree, of course, that investment in American business is important, but I am sure that few would say that there is nothing more important than such investment. We cannot, for example, sacrifice necessary provisions for defense in order to encourage American business. We cannot neglect our international problems in the interest of stimulating such investment. Nor can we sacrifice any large number of our own people to poverty or to unemployment in the interest of investment in business. What we have reflected in the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury is at best an acceptance of the trickle-down theory, and more obviously an acceptance of the old fallacy of accepting the primacy of economics over every other consideration. It leads one to believe that President Wilson was right when he said that the Republicans thought that the only persons who could be trusted with the prosperity and welfare of the Nation were those who had the greatest material stake in it.

In view of this emphasis on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and the acceptance of his judgments by the President, we should not be surprised to learn, as we could from a recent report of the U. S. News & World Report, that during the time covered by its survey the President had invited 294 businessmen to his dinners but during the same period, only 9 farmers. That while he had invited 294 businessmen, he had invited 8 labor union officials; 294 businessmen, but 6 church leaders; 294 businessmen, but only 30 educators.

We should not be too surprised at what the Secretary of the Treasury recommends with regard to taxes, since he stated to the Ways and Means Committee of the House that the only purpose which the Ways and Means Committee was to take into consideration in connection with tax programs was that of raising revenue. He said that ques-

tions of social reform, or social well-being, should not be considered in relation to tax policy. I suppose that had he been hard pressed, he would not have recommended, at least publicly, that taxes should be imposed so heavily upon low-income groups that they could not adequately support their families, but such a conclusion is certainly inherent in the tax policy which he announced to the committee.

The political and economic philosophy is perhaps best summarized in his statement: "We must remember the fundamental principle that the best government is the least government." If this principle, as he calls it, were accepted and carried to its logical conclusion, one would be an anarchist advocating no government at all. This statement of Humphrey does not express any kind of fundamental principle, but rather a fundamental misunderstanding of the function of government. The best government is the government which is adequate to the needs of the people and which performs those functions which government should perform. The function of laws in government and governmental institutions is to protect people from force and violence by those who are more powerful either in terms of physical, or economic power, or whatever other power they may possess; and on the positive side to promote as the preamble to our Constitution says, "the general welfare." In the period in which government was weak in this country, we had exploitation in the economic field by powerful forces—exploitation of men through unjust and depressed wages and inhuman working conditions; exploitation of consumers and of competitors; and exploitation, also, of our natural resources. It was the policy of those who were interested in such exploitation to keep government weak, because they were then relatively strong. The history of the United States shows that through government the people of the country have come to exercise some measure of control over these forces, and through government action to secure some measure of justice for all of our citizens. Of course, if government were weakened, the economic institutions and forces in which the Secretary of the Treasury is interested could operate with greater freedom and independence and so could use their power without intervention, or without opposition by government.

We need not question his integrity, nor his good intentions, but certainly we can question his judgment. If what he has said indicates what he really thinks, and if he intends to carry through to logical conclusions the potential of his political philosophy, then we have genuine cause to be concerned and to be alarmed, and, as active members of the Democratic Party, to intensify our efforts to continue control not only of the Congress of the United States, but also of the executive branch of the Government; not with the intention of using that power and control to advance our personal interests or the limited interests of the Democratic Party, but with the purpose in mind of controlling government and using it so that the best interests of the people of the United States may be served by the Government.

Persecution of the Church in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 8th day of May constitutes the second

anniversary of the issuance of the last official protest of the Catholic clergy in Poland against persecution of the church by the state Communist authorities. Severe repression has made subsequent effective protests impossible.

In view of the continued persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain, contrary to all human laws, and to international law, it is timely today to recall this memorable occasion.

On May 8, 1953, the last assembly of the Polish bishops was held in Krakow. The occasion was the 700th anniversary of the canonization of St. Stanislaw Szczepanowski, bishop of Krakow and patron of Poland. The Polish episcopate then assembled in Krakow, sent to Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the State Council in Warsaw, a lengthy document presenting the situation of the church and religious life in Poland from 1950 to 1953 under Communist domination.

The document, an example of a great moderation, of a deep understanding of the apostolic mission of the church and of great love for the Polish nation, does not enter into any polemics, but states and lists "before God and history" the wrongs which Marxism has been doing to the Catholic Church and the Polish nation, trying to deprive it of its thousand-year-old Christian tradition and attempting to destroy in Poland the faith of the people in God.

This memorial has become the last great document of the Polish episcopate containing the signature of the Primate Cardinal Stephen Wyszyński. From that time it was impossible to hold another assembly of the Polish episcopate and from that time on the bishops were prevented from presenting any further documents on religious life in Poland and on the fate of the church there. Five months thereafter Cardinal Wyszyński, the head of the church in Poland, was placed under arrest and has not been heard from since.

At the very beginning of the document, the bishops state: "In accordance with truth, the Polish episcopate feels it is its duty to state that the situation of the church in Poland is not only not improving but, on the contrary, is steadily deteriorating. The responsibility toward God, the community and history demands that at least the more menacing negative aspects be named without covering them up, and defined accurately." After this preamble the bishops gave a list of wrongs which the Communist regime had committed during the past 3 years against the church in Poland. Among these wrongs the episcopate enumerates the "removal of religion from the schools and of God from the hearts of the youth," "political pressure and attempts of diversion among the clergy," "absolute destruction of the Catholic press and periodicals," "intrusion in church affairs and attempts at hindering Apostolic activities of the church," "unusual hard fate of the church in western territories."

Each of these charges was supported by substantial evidence. Furthermore, the episcopate emphasized "attempts and efforts of the episcopate in creating mutual relations."

The document was ended by a solemn declaration of the bishops of the following conditions:

POLISH BISHOPS' DECLARATION

Feeling that it is their highest duty, the Polish episcopate points herewith to the tragic fate of the church in Poland, to the symptoms of the oppression and its causes, and the sources from which flows the concern, the anxiety, and the exasperation of the broad masses of the Catholic community.

We see the basic and main cause of this state of affairs in the hatred which destroys the strength of our country and seems to forebode sinister wrangles. We are acting not with any controversial aims in mind, but only to emphasize the burning necessity of finding an honest and fair way out of the existing situation. We are seeking a positive solution, which would be beneficial both to the church and the state. Nothing is further from us than to destroy the unity, to introduce dissension, or spread hatred. So this time again we do not refuse to reach an agreement, we do not forsake the will for a peaceful solution and collaboration in the important task of a successful settlement of relations between church and state in accordance with the agreement reached on April 14, 1950. However, in the present state of affairs it depends solely on the sincere and good will of the government whether internal peace and reciprocal harmony which are so essential, will be really achieved. It depends on whether the government will forsake its radical, destructive hate toward Catholicism, whether it will abandon its aim of subjugating the church and turning it into an instrument of the state.

We wish that the government should clearly understand what the decree about the filling of church positions really means for the structure of the church. We therefore remind that by this act, which is illegal according to the constitution, the state has usurped for itself the right to a constant intrusion in the internal affairs of the church, sometimes pertaining to the conscience of the priests, and to a willful and systematic subjection of church jurisdiction to its own will.

This is inadmissible from the point of view of the church. First because the jurisdiction of the church pertains to strictly religious, internal and supernatural matters, such as teaching God's revelation, the teaching of Christian morals, the administration of the Holy Sacraments, the organization of religious services, the spiritual guidance of the souls and the consciences of the people.

In the name of what rights could the authority over such strictly religious matters be submitted to the authority of the state, which by its nature pertains to matters which are exclusively secular and temporal? Particularly, if that authority is based upon a materialistic and anti-religious ideology, and is filled with destructive hatred toward the church? Every person, even an atheist, should understand that such a dependence is quite impossible. Therefore Lenin justly condemned the subjugation of the church to the state as a "cursed and disgraceful" thing. This is moreover, an impossible thing for the church because, in accordance with its unalterable constitution, with regard to which even the Pope is helpless, there is not and cannot be in that Catholic community another jurisdictional authority except the one which flows from above, from the Pope and the Bishops.

Therefore, whenever the secular authority willfully tries to grasp the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in order to make it dependent, it usurps something which does not belong to it, and violates not only the rights of the church, but also the divine law. On what basis therefore could the government require of the Polish episcopate to accept a fact which is so glaringly inconsistent with the

structure of the church and its rights, and which even violates the sacred divine laws.

Shortly after the announcement of the decree about filling the church positions, representatives of the episcopate deemed it their duty to make a formal protest in that matter. Today, the whole Polish episcopate protests.

We declare, aware of our apostolic mission, in a most solemn and categorical manner, that we cannot consider as legal and binding this decree, because it is inconsistent with the constitution of the Polish People's Republic, and violates the laws of God and of the church. "One should obey God rather than men."

We do not refuse to take into consideration the motives and the suggestions of the government. But in filling church positions we must be directed by divine and by ecclesiastical law, and we must appoint only those priests whom we consider, in our conscience, as fit and worthy. We find it difficult to hide how little worthy of those positions, especially the more important ones, are those, who yielded to external political pressure and allowed themselves to be used as instruments of diversion in the church. Those priests give very slight guaranty that, as representatives of the church, they will defend with devotion and firmness the essential and divine principles and rights of the church.

If it should happen that external factors will make it impossible for us to appoint competent and proper people to ecclesiastical positions, we are decided to leave them vacant rather than to place the spiritual rule of souls in the hands of unworthy individuals. And if someone should dare to accept any ecclesiastical position from outside (the church) let him know, that by the same fact he falls under the heavy punishment of excommunication.

Similarly, if we are placed before the alternative: either to subject ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the state making it an instrument of the latter, or to bear a personal sacrifice, we will not hesitate, we will follow the voice of our apostolic vocation and our conscience as priests, with peace of mind and the knowledge that we have not given the slightest reason for persecution, that suffering becomes our lot for no other reason than the cause of Christ and His church.

We are not allowed to place the things belonging to God on the altar of Caesar. *Non possumus.*

We respect the personal opinions of all people, also those of our present adversaries, whom we as Christians are not permitted to hate—but we demand the same respect for the religious opinions of Catholic Poles, especially children and the youth.

We respect the duties toward the nation and the state, and often remind our faithful about them, but at the same time we demand that no obstacles be placed in the way of Catholics for the performing of their duties toward God and the church. We are conscious of the special tasks and duties of the Catholic priest toward his country, and that is why we often reminded our priests about them, requesting their solicitude for the development and welfare of our country. But we also demand with emphasis that our priests should not be torn away from their religious duties, that they should not be drawn into political affairs which are alien to their vocation, that political pressure aimed at using them as instruments in the struggle of the state against the church be stopped, that they should not be forced to break their oath by which they pledged loyalty to the church and their bishops.

In short, in accordance with the principle of separation of church and state, as guaranteed in our constitution, the state must abstain from interfering in the religious, spiritual, and internal affairs of the church.

In the name of the welfare of our nation, we have the right to demand from the lead-

ers of the Marxist camp a revision of the principles of ruthless hatred and ostracism toward our religion, the church and God. The Polish episcopate demands from the council of ministers that, in accordance with article 32.7 of the constitution of the Polish Peoples Republic, it undertake the defense of the rights of Catholics in the Polish Peoples Republic.

This memorable episcopate letter of May 8, 1953, can be well described as an important historical document in the war against God, religion, and the church in Poland conducted by the Communist regime.

The history of this war with God and religion in a previous period, from 1945 to 1950, is described by another Polish episcopate letter dated September 12, 1950. It was signed by Cardinal Adam Stefan Sapieha and by the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszyński. It was unanimously adopted by all the Polish bishops assembled in Czestochowa and forwarded to President Boleslaw Bierut. In it the following was said:

In the history of the Catholic Church in Poland the last 5 years (1945-50) have been marked by unprecedented oppression. Unilateral withdrawal of the concordat by the Polish state; failure of the state to give recognition to the church organizations in western occupied lands; the failure to permit renewal of Catholic organizational activities; gradual but steady liquidation of Catholic schools; unusually strong limitations on religious press and religious publications by censorship and limitations so that they have almost ceased to exist; depriving the church of diocesan publications; taking over by the state of social organizations and hospitals belonging to the church; barring of organization church life and compulsive registration of cloisters; limitation on the public freedom of religious cults and limitations of the right to conduct Mass and religious practices, such as missions, public processions, religious gatherings and congresses; the liquidation of the church welfare organization Caritas; nationalization of church properties; the press campaign against the episcopate; the limitation of religious practices in schools; removal from the schools of hundreds of religious text books; support of youth organizations with ideology inimical to Christianity; support of publications discrediting historically the accomplishments of the church in the field of science and national life; antireligious propaganda conducted by the press, by lectures, and by thousands of publications; limitations on the freedom of conscience of members of organizations, parties, and trade unions; antireligious propaganda in kindergartens and schools, summer camps, and in youth camps; the use of the whole administrative apparatus, the courts, police authorities, and tax offices to exert pressure on the conscience of the citizenry and of the priests and bishops. All this is only a partial list and does not give a picture of the whole truth of the situation of the Catholic Church after 5 years (1945-50). Having this in mind the episcopate has, on many occasions, presented its complaints and protests to you, Mr. President and chairman of the committee of ministers. Unfortunately, it was without results. The last year, 1949-50, particularly after the concordat of April 14, 1950, was marked by a hastening of the tempo of the liquidation of the church's social institutions and activities.

This document of September 12, 1950, together with that of the Polish episcopate of May 8, 1953, gives a true picture of the religious persecution in Poland on the part of the Communist regime in the

period from 1945 to 1953. They present a picture of the brutal war with God, religion, and the church conducted by the Communists in Poland.

With the arrest of the Polish Primate Cardinal Stephan Wyszyński on September 26, 1953, and his imprisonment by the Communists, an end came to the period in which the Polish episcopate could present this type of memorial, which is now a historical document, to the Warsaw regime. Since that time it is unknown where the Polish primate is imprisoned, what his condition of health is, and under what circumstances he is living. Despite the fact that it has been requested from all parts of the world, the Communist regime has to this day given no official information regarding him.

The high moral position which Cardinal Wyszyński has gained in the Catholic world is best attested to by the greeting sent by the American cardinals and bishops to Cardinal Wyszyński through the Voice of America during the last Christmas holidays. Cardinals Spellman, Stritch, Mooney, and McIntyre joined in the greetings, as did also a number of American bishops such as O'Boyle, Alter, Donahue, Keough, Lucey, Byrne, Gannon, Russell, Meyer, O'Hara, Cushing, Wosnicki, Kroll, and many other high dignitaries of the Catholic Church in the United States. They all emphasized the fact that in Cardinal Wyszyński, the primate of Poland, they see "a symbol of courage which every man should display in defense of freedom."

The Communist attack on the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszyński opened a new period of religious persecution in Poland. The war with God, religion, and the church took on a new form, but it never stopped or slackened.

After nearly 2 years the Polish bishops and the Polish episcopate are Communist prisoners of the Warsaw regime. Deprived of its leader, the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszyński, there have been no plenary assemblies of the Polish episcopate for nearly 2 years. After 2 years the episcopate has been compelled by the Communist regime to be silent. The bishops have very rarely been able to be heard, and then only on strictly religious matters and on subjects in which they are compelled to speak by the Communists.

On the other hand, immediately after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszyński the Warsaw regime has pushed to the forefront the so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics. In the memorial of September 12, 1950, the bishops already affirmed that these patriot priests were in conflict with their moral and church obligations, and many of them were under church discipline. As to the so-called progressive Catholics, they were publicly condemned in February 1950 by the Primate Cardinal Wyszyński, who confirmed the fact that their activities and the activities of their publications cannot be considered as Catholic.

In the fall of 1953, after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszyński, the Communists called to life the so-called State Committee of Catholic, Ecclesiastical, and Lay Activists of the National Front.

This committee was given the job of diversional work among the Catholic people. Later the Communists added to this group the "patriot priests," putting them under leadership of "progressive Catholics."

How ineffective was the work of this committee and how effective were the auditions of the western radio, particularly Voice of America, as best evidenced by the statement of the secretary-general of this committee on February 22, 1955, who, despairing on the lack of ability to operate effectively, said:

This national committee having ambitions to influence and to direct the processes of evolutions now going on in the minds of clergy cannot at any time afford to neglect the influence of western radio of diversional character on a certain group of priests and Catholics in general. These radios lost their appeal for the Polish people by unmasking their lies and hatred toward anything which is cherished in the heart of every Pole. Nevertheless these radio programs aim to disturb the minds of the faithful and to exploit for hostile political aims religious feelings and devotion to the church of people.

One of the means used by these western radios—which flatters us because it strengthens our belief in the righteousness of our ideals—is an avalanche of lies and insults directed against our movement. Our strength and our achievements compelled the enemy propaganda to also change its methods. Even they noticed our great movement and ineffectiveness to combat it from outside as it was when they successfully went to isolate progressive Catholic movement. Therefore the struggle has been changed for a diversion with the scope to concentrate on disintegrating processes and opportunistic tendencies within our movement. It is logical—if one is unable to conquer or destroy a movement, if one cannot retract its development, he must try to weaken this movement, to loosen it and undermine its ideals.

And therefore the weight of enemy propaganda is pushing now not on our organizational forces—it is even afraid to use its name—but is attacking the very ideology. The enemy propaganda is trying to undermine among the people its confidence in this ideology and abate its authority. They talk no more about a heretical group or heretical ideology, they discriminate not only people and their activities, but they strike against the fundamental belief of progressive Catholics.

This is the reason why we must come to certain conclusions for our further activity, why we have to deepen morale of our activists and take care of a high moral standard of our leading groups.

This wailing of those who were bent on destroying religious life in Poland is good evidence that their efforts have been unsuccessful and have not fallen on fertile ground.

In the perspective of 10 years of religious persecution in Poland and in the light of the history of 10 years of the war of Communists with God, religion, and the church in Poland, it is now clear how important were the statements of the Polish episcopate. It is obvious that the Communists to the present time have been losing that war. The Polish nation has successfully fought off the attacks. This, however, does not minimize for a moment the dangers which appear to exist. The Communists have chosen Poland as the base of their great diversion war with the entire Christian world.

The so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics are being used by the Communists to divert activities in various countries in the world. They are being sent to Belgium, France, Italy, and even to North Vietnam and to the United States under the guise of various missions, sometime diplomatic. The Catholic mask is used to conceal their Communist activity to procure advantages for Moscow. We must consider these matters when we reflect on this second anniversary of the historical document, the memorial of the Polish episcopate of May 8, 1953. We must remember that the goal of the Communists is not only to destroy the Catholic world in Poland, but to destroy all religious activities everywhere in the world, including these United States.

Limiting the Power of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the other day a proposal in Congress to reduce personal taxes by a meager \$20 a head was called fiscal irresponsibility. That was true because of worse fiscal irresponsibility by Congress for more than 20 years right up to this minute. It has been making appropriations for grants-in-aid, loans, subsidies, and gifts. It has authorized spending, borrowing, and running deficits that make the proposed reduction in taxes impossible—irresponsible. This costs us more than \$10 billion annually. It takes at least 1,400,000 Federal employees to operate our extraneous, unconstitutional functions of government. They cost in salaries and other overhead more than \$6 billion. Nine hundred thousand employees could perform all the legitimate constitutional nonmilitary functions of government—and do a better job.

Our dollars are cut in half with fantastic Federal debts and mortgages amounting to more than half the value of our property. That means that half the value of our private property has been confiscated or transferred to government already. When income is taken up to 92 percent by government that means individual responsibility to manage ourselves and our property is suspended.

Something has to be done about it. Or we shall have unlimited governmental irresponsibility in the management of our affairs permanently fastened upon us.

Indeed, is it not a fact that any people who tolerate mere men exercising unlimited powers over them have become themselves temporarily irresponsible? No sensible organization of men turns loose its officers to do anything they like and spend whatever they please. Their powers are always specified and limited in scope and spending to carry out the stated purposes of the organiza-

tion. Congress is in that ridiculous position of being unlimited in functions and spending power.

Do we need another decade—even another day—to demonstrate that Congress is incapable of correcting its own helplessness without the people's help.

The simple remedy, then, lies in taking away from Congress the excess power to appropriate the people's property which it now exercises. Limiting its spending power necessarily limits its functions. A first step in that direction has been taken by the introduction of an amendment to the Constitution by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182.

Congressman REED, when he introduced the amendment in the House on January 3, 1955, summarized its provisions as follows:

First. As to income taxes: the amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate incomes may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes: The amendment gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal recognizes some basic first principles that the Marxian tax system we now have does not. First, there is a point of diminishing returns in the collection of taxes. Low rates may produce more revenue than high rates. Second, the great bulk of income taxes in a progressive rate system is collected from the lowest tax brackets; and third, that as between separate governmental taxing units, the one closest to the people can perform most efficiently and economically.

The first principle is best illustrated by the use of Henry Ford as an example. In 40 years, Mr. Ford's fortune increased from \$1,000 to \$1 billion. If the Ford Motor Co. had been subjected to a 50-percent income tax during that 40-year period, its net worth would have been only \$1,470,000 and would have paid only \$1,470,000 in taxes; but with a 20-percent income tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been \$66,500,000 and taxes collected \$16,600,000 or almost 16 times as much as collections from a 50-percent tax. On that principle American mass-production was built. We have proved to the world that mass-produced, low per unit cost products yield more profits and pay more taxes than high per unit costs and high rates of taxes.

To illustrate: During the 1920's the high World War I tax rates were drastically lowered. The following table shows that although maximum rates

were lowered and personal exemptions increased the revenue yield was greater:

Year	Total internal-revenue collections	Maximum rate (percent)	Personal exemptions
1925.....	\$2,584,140,000	40	\$2,500
1926.....	2,836,000,000	24	3,000
1927.....	2,865,863,000	24	3,500
1929.....	2,939,054,000	20	3,500
1930.....	3,040,146,000	20	3,500

The reason for this is obvious. The great bulk of revenue comes from the first and lowest bracket of the income taxpayers. For many years about 85 percent of all taxes collected have come from the lowest bracket, viz, being the 20-percent bracket. Only 3 percent, or about \$2 billion, is provided by rates in excess of 34 percent.

It is obvious from the foregoing that if the Government continues to require large revenues, the lowest income producers will be required to provide by far the greatest share of taxes. Conversely, tax relief in the lower brackets results in the largest possible reinvestment in production and tends to increase profits and taxes paid to the Government.

So real relief can be effected only by drastically reducing expenditures or by reducing the tax rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. As Congressman REED points out, this would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

The most important effect of the amendment is the restoration to the States of the fiscal ability to meet the needs of their people. The States have lost that power to a great extent and consequently have either been forced to rely on the various grants-in-aid programs, or have surrendered to the Federal Government the responsibility for the performance of services that are primarily of State and local concern. This shift of power and responsibility is in clear violation of our constitutional concept that the unit of government closest to the people can most capably serve them. The Constitution provides for a neat division of powers, reserving to the States the bulk of sovereignty and granting only explicit and very limited powers to the Central Government.

This balance has been upset by reckless use of the unlimited taxing power granted to the Federal Government by the 16th amendment and the court interpretations of it. By preempting the tax sources the Central Government has been successful in arrogating to itself virtual control over the lives and property and liberties of the American people. The States exist too much by sufferance and function too often as agents for the distribution of the Federal largesse. The extent of the shift of sovereignty is indicated by the fact that 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax-revenues in the Nation, while today the Federal Government collects 75 percent. The pen is indeed mightier than the sword, but the power of the purse is invincible.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal reverses this trend toward centralizing government power by restoring to the States

some of the sources of tax revenues. The amendment returns to the States the exclusive power to levy death and gift taxes. These taxes constitute a small item in the Federal tax picture—about 1 percent—but represents a considerable revenue to the States. The right to control the transfer and devolution of property is one of the historical attributes of sovereignty, and clearly belongs to the States. Secondly, the amendment's limitation on confiscatory rates in the higher brackets guarantees to the States that the wealth created within their boundaries will remain there to create more wealth and consequently produce more and greater tax revenues for the States.

The amendment is a compromise, recognizing that in emergency situations the Federal Government must have great fiscal powers. But it also assures the American people of fiscal and, consequently, political sanity in normal times. That is the least we can do for the Nation's 66 million taxpayers.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the House, January 31, 1955, by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introducing House Joint Resolution 182—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ percent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely,

first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be (mean) inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is \$63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in brief, Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years of 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

*Expenditures
(in billions)*

1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)-----	\$44.058
1950 -----	39.606
1949 -----	39.507
1948 -----	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was \$18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

First. A reduction in the individual income-tax rates to 10 percent on incomes up to \$10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of \$10,000; and

Second. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to \$47 billion, which is \$3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is \$7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to \$41.5 billion. This is \$2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the \$33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about \$2 bil-

lion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It is too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government; or second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and in-

creases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the Senate, January 21, 1955, by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introducing Senate Joint Resolution 23—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX
INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes, and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist Manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance, the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income-tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of \$2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than \$200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed, the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this: The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small taxpayer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about \$2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about \$60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only \$100 in the present \$600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increase would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of \$2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small-tax payers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive en-

terprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25-percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was \$891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of \$74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small business. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953 was that estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry.

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

Tax Deductions for Care of Mentally and Physically Handicapped Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide tax deductions for expenses incurred

in the care of mentally and physically handicapped dependents. This would amend the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which limit these deductions to a woman or a widower or to a husband who is legally separated from his wife.

Under the present regulation, a man either has to be divorced or legally separated from a mentally or physically disabled wife or else a widower in order to qualify for deductions for expenses incurred in the care of his children. I cannot believe that it was the intent of Congress to discriminate in favor of either death or divorce. A taxpayer having dependents who are mentally or physically incapable of caring for themselves often find it impossible to provide this care personally and maintain his or her employment at the same time. In such a situation, it seems to me that a taxpayer is entitled to relief. By amending section 214 (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, my bill provides this relief not only to women, widowers, and divorcees, but also to those who have maintained their matrimonial ties.

Everyone Is Hard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with prosperity—if determined by dollars in hand—not just around the corner—not sitting on the doorstep—but inside, right at the elbow, practically everyone is having money trouble. It will increase when money becomes tight.

INDIVIDUALS' TROUBLES

An industrial executive had a yearly salary of \$75,000; an annual income of an equal amount from dividends. He did not drink, gamble, entertain socially, nor spend his money foolishly. He had a good but modest home in a comparatively small city. He had a summer place in the West; tried to get a month's annual vacation.

However, the demands made upon him for contributions for charitable and other purposes, and which he felt he could not resist, kept him in a financially tight situation where he had to take a look at his checking account before deciding upon any sizable expenditure. His salary and dividends came from a business which he had created, which gave employment to upward of 3,000 people at above the average wage scale. He was as hard pressed for current funds as the lowest paid employee.

Another acquaintance, a professional man in a small community, makes between 30 and 40 thousand a year and though his tastes are moderate, is always hard up when income tax day rolls around.

Then, I know many conservative, would-be industrious citizens who, because they are past 45, find it difficult

to get a job. Others, older—notwithstanding social security or other Government payments, find it extremely difficult to get their hands on funds enough to enable them to live comfortably, even though they have no expensive habits. They suffer more than any other group.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Government, which collects billions of dollars from the taxpayers—it has no other source of revenue—makes no serious effort to live within its income.

The Government on just one item alone—storage of farm surpluses—each day adds \$1 million to its national debt—the annual interest charge on which is now upwards of \$6.4 billion—but there is still no solution of the farm problem. Farm prices, notwithstanding rigid support, continue to drop.

Municipalities, as well as individuals, seem to have accepted literally the Biblical statement "Ask and ye shall receive"—forgotten that the Federal Government, which sometimes collects \$2.19 for each dollar it passes out, does not have creative power—forgotten that "The Lord helps those who help themselves."

THE ANSWER?—IT IS OBVIOUS

Our creative and productive ability has increased far beyond our dreams, but we follow the methods of the Prodigal Son; waste our priceless inheritance. Spend beyond our needs—for things desirable but not strictly necessary. Buying but not paying—postponing to future generations whose welfare we seem to have forgotten the day of reckoning.

Unpleasant as it may be, consideration for those we bring into the world demands that as individuals, as government, we limit our spending to the purchase of necessities—to what we earn or have ability to repay—in the near future.

Unless we do, some of us may live to regret it. Certainly those who come after will have cause to condemn us.

Personal Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 days I have been pretty much flat on my back with a virus that bit me rather severely, and I have been unable to attend the sessions of the House. From the look of the RECORD, it seems as though there have been more rollcalls, quorum calls, and votes than might have occurred normally in the period of a couple of weeks. Since I had no control over the timing when those bugs were going to bite, I was unable to attend the sessions and consequently have no recorded votes on the bills which came up on the floor of the House.

However, had I been present I would have voted for the conference report on

the postal pay raise. Although I firmly believe the President will veto the present bill, I nevertheless feel the bill should get before the President for his immediate action so it can become law or be vetoed. Then the Congress can quit playing politics with the purse strings of the postal and civil-service employees of this country and produce legislation which will put money into their pockets now.

I also would have voted against recommitment of the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, for I believe both Territories are ready for statehood. According to the RECORD, there was a lot of talk about Communist influence and Harry Bridges in the Hawaiian Islands and apparently for that reason, a lot of the Members voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I thought the remarks of Congressman RUSSELL MACK, of Washington, were very pertinent when he stated:

Why should we punish Hawaii by depriving her of statehood for something that we ourselves have not done?

In other words, the United States had been unable to get rid of Harry Bridges during a period of a good many years, yet some would deprive Hawaii of statehood for inability to get rid of him in a comparatively short time. This reasoning seems entirely illogical to me.

Coming from a district which is close to Alaska, I am particularly concerned with statehood for that Territory. I believe the people of Alaska have demonstrated their ability to govern themselves and to become a member of the United States. I therefore would have voted in favor of statehood for both of these Territories.

Fishers Island Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the bill which I have introduced calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods, H. R. 6093, I wish to bring to the attention of the House today some additional information.

If I were to predict that during the next Atlantic hurricane season millions of dollars in personal property and many entire industries now located on Connecticut shores will be wiped out, I believe that this body would institute some sort of emergency powers to get action in time to prevent such a catastrophe.

Well, after personally inspecting the Fishers Island Sound area last weekend I do so predict—if last year's violence is repeated. The Stonington area, for example, where one of my Hartford constituents' plant is located, will suffer damage not alone from the extreme violence of a hurricane but even more likely from the lesser furies of Atlantic storms

which now sweep in from the east and southeast with increasing regularity.

A native son of Stonington and president of the Stonington Boat Works, Inc., Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., has proposed what appears to be the best defense at the least expense for this extremely vulnerable area. His plan, which suggests a series of breakwaters extending on a broken line, following the reefs, from Watch Hill Point, R. I., to the east point of Fishers Island, N. Y., promises protection for the greatest number of people and their properties. I have yet to see a so-called coastal erosion plan by a single construction project which would protect such an extensive area as these shores of Fishers Island Sound in Rhode Island, New York, and Connecticut.

The proposed Palmer breakwaters would restore that line of reefs from Watch Hill Point to East Point, Fishers Island, to its former protective status.

Since those reefs have been flattened, in recent years, and only since then, has Stonington Harbor lost its value as a harbor of refuge. In a strong easterly storm there is no harbor of refuge now between New London, Conn., and Point Judith, R. I. A comparison of older charts with the new will show that Stonington Harbor, for example, has lost its usefulness as such in almost direct ratio with the gradual lowering of those reef barriers.

Consequently, heavy seas now sweep into the Stonington area directly from the Atlantic Ocean and the wave action continues on down the Connecticut shoreline in a westerly direction. This, I say, happens during easterly storms, which occur with increasing regularity. Water damage along this extensive Connecticut coastline is still greater during the hurricane season.

Connecticut, like many other States, is anxiously trying to attract new industry. But many long-established industries along this Connecticut coastline have said they would leave if they must suffer the severe water damage of 1938, of 1944, of 1954; resulting from the cumulative power of Atlantic wave action; if they must be continually threatened by storm-driven seas which now enter Fishers Island Sound over the once-protective reef line between Watch Hill and Fishers Island. Even the Stonington fishing fleet, Connecticut's largest, will have to seek refuge elsewhere unless Federal action is forthcoming soon.

I have therefore introduced a bill asking for authority to investigate and correct this situation by the construction of breakwaters to protect the entire Fishers Island Sound area. Since personally inspecting the reef line between Watch Hill, R. I., and Fishers Island, N. Y., last Friday, I am more convinced than ever that this is our first line of defense. I ask that the provisions of this bill be given immediate consideration by the Secretary of the Army and that he instruct the Chief of Engineers to expedite the necessary survey and immediately to take appropriate action in the most expeditious manner possible toward the construction of those breakwaters.

I am well aware of the hazards of hurricane violence which threaten the en-

tire Atlantic seaboard. However, while I respect the needs of others, I would remind this body that to my knowledge no other such extensive and heavily populated and highly assessed area so threatened can be so readily protected by a single project of breakwaters construction. The need is apparent to those who would study and compare the coastal charts, past and present. It is a need which can be fulfilled, and easily so, whenever authorized by Congress.

I ask that this project be given serious consideration, that it be given the same degree of priority in any overall Atlantic seaboard coastal erosion legislation that the area in question was given by the hurricanes of 1938, of 1944, of 1954.

"American Secretaries Are Bringing to Their Positions Today a Wider Knowledge of Business and World Affairs Than Considered Necessary in the Past"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks declared April 23-30 as National Secretaries Week. All over the country that week our great band of girl Fridays took bows for their very real contribution to our American way of life. Moreover, the 300 chapters of the National Secretaries Association—International—observed the week by highlighting the educational projects for which it has gained national recognition and which have been of tremendous benefit to secretaries and management.

I was proud, indeed, Mr. Speaker, when my own secretary on Capitol Hill, Miss Marjorie Clough, of Cleveland, Ohio, who has been associated with me for almost 10 years, was invited to speak at an all-day workshop meeting of the chapters of the National Secretaries Association of Greater Youngstown, Ohio.

When Miss Clough reported to the Congressman representing Youngstown—the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN—that she was going into his district, he presented her with a toy donkey which I feel sure she will cherish, especially as Mr. KIRWAN emphasized the nonpartisanship of the little mascot. And he further asked her to convey his greetings to the meeting.

Miss Ann C. Hudak and others of Youngstown had skillfully arranged a full day of activities at the beautiful Butler Art Institute. Included on the program was another good friend of mine from Cleveland, Mr. A. L. Bittkofer, supervisor of character education for the Cleveland public schools, who conducted a lively discussion on human relations in and out of business.

May I express my appreciation at this time to the United States Information Agency and to Mr. William Hamilton, of the public information staff, who generously arranged to have Miss Clough take with her a color movie which vividly portrays what our Government is doing to combat Soviet propaganda behind the Iron Curtain. The showing of this film added greatly to the program of the day.

Mr. Speaker, because I know Miss Clough was speaking for and about us all in this great body, I believe my colleagues will enjoy reading what she said that day in Youngstown. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith the tribute of Secretary Weeks to the American secretary and Miss Clough's statement:

THE SECRETARY SENSES THE NEED

(Remarks of Miss Marjorie Clough, executive assistant to Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, before a meeting of the Youngstown Chapters, National Secretaries' Association, April 30, 1955)

It is a privilege to be here today to join with this distinguished group in paying honor to secretaries everywhere.

When Miss Helmes, of the Women's Bureau in Washington, told me of this workshop you are holding today, I was gratified to know that I would be invited to take part in it.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks is to be commended for proclaiming National Secretaries' Week across the Nation.

Indeed, I think there is special significance for our great army of Girl Fridays in another announcement which came from Mr. Weeks' office this week: The announcement which told of the high state of the Nation's prosperity.

For I would say that without the secretary, equipped as she is with a sort of built-in radar system we call the sixth sense—I doubt if such a record could have been possible by the great and small enterprises which constitute the American way of life.

To be in Youngstown itself, is a privilege. I come from a family of men who have long dealt in steel and the products of steel. I understand what it means to the prosperity of our Nation when the night skies over Youngstown and Bethlehem and Pittsburgh and Cleveland are aglow from the white-hot furnaces and open hearths of the greatest steel industry in the world.

And may I take this moment to tell you what I am sure you already know: That the people of Youngstown are fortunate to be represented in Congress by Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. A high compliment was paid to him recently by a friend who said: "MIKE KIRWAN is MIKE KIRWAN 365 days of the year." It can certainly be said that he puts the welfare of the country and of his people above and beyond party politics.

You may wonder why I have been chosen to speak at your meeting today. They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether or not this is true.

What I do know is that from the first day on that first job many years ago—paying \$60 a month, Monday through Saturday—I have been filled with faith in the role which an obscure girl could someday play in our society.

I hope I am not mistaken when I say that only in America are the men and women at Cabinet level, the men and women of the President's Cabinet who make foreign policy and defense policy and domestic policy—known as secretaries!

And today when my Congresswoman leaves the supervision of her congressional office to me when on some important mission in our country or abroad, I realize that the faith of

the obscure girl at the Woodstock typewriter has been confirmed.

They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether this is true or not. I do know that I am associated with a wonderful woman in Washington.

In order to tell you about my work, I must tell you something about Congressman BOLTON.

FRANCES P. BOLTON

Public life was nothing new to Mrs. Bolton when the death of her husband, the late Hon. Chester C. Bolton, left a vacant seat in the House of Representatives in 1939. She had had 10 years as wife of a Congressman, and had gone through many campaigns at his side, and made many speeches in his behalf.

But now she faced an important decision of her own, whether or not to run for the seat left vacant in Congress. There were the inaudible suggestions that as a woman she was not sufficiently educated in the law or one of the professions. There were the fears and doubts which seem always to beset men and women when comes the call to higher service.

But having put her hand to the plow, and winning that first election hands down back in 1940—she hasn't looked back, but has pushed steadily forward into new and challenging experiences which have inspired men and women everywhere.

Mrs. Bolton is a highly respected member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her thought reaches out to the problems of peoples and nations around the world as their affairs touch upon our own at the international level.

Her deep sense of humanity and understanding of the basic needs of mankind, make her the staunch ally of America's friends the world over.

Mrs. BOLTON enjoys the unqualified confidence not only of her colleagues in Congress, but of the leaders of the executive branch as well. This was borne out when President Eisenhower appointed her the first woman Member of Congress to serve as a delegate to the United Nations. Her services there involved the daily handling of strategic information of the highest classification.

Men grumble a bit sometimes, about women in positions of responsibility. Here's a personal observation to end all grumbling:

A staff member of the Foreign Affairs Committee told me one day that Mrs. BOLTON was one of the few legislators he had ever seen—man or woman—who could influence votes in a committee meeting through pure logic and persuasive ability. She tries to resolve conflict of opinion and bring about a workable and just compromise.

He went on to say that she was the person who had convinced him that women have a constructive place to fill in public life. "Frankly, until I saw her in operation, I thought women ought to stay home."

What a tribute to woman's place in American endeavor today.

A little more about Mrs. BOLTON.

Hard work and long hours on the Hill are what the job demands in Congress. Mrs. BOLTON gives freely of both. She is a perfectionist to the smallest detail, but asks nothing from those around her which she does not first demand from herself. She finds no time in her active life for small talk about people or things.

Her wit and good humor save many a situation in our busy office. Some weeks ago I found a newspaper clipping propped under my nose—at a moment of when things were going "seven ways to Sunday" as Mrs. Bolton often says.

The story told about a young woman applying for a secretarial position.

"What are your special qualifications," she was asked?

Her reply: "I can look like a woman and think like a man, act like a lady, and work like a dog."

The business of thinking and acting like a whole-souled woman is what is important to FRANCES BOLTON.

STAYING IN CONGRESS

Let nobody tell you that it is easy for a man or a woman to serve in Congress. It takes something special to get there, and something very special to stay.

That something special isn't just the ability to wage fiery battle for some piece of legislation, to meet the needs of constituents, to make quick decisions or to write good letters. Some or all of this, to be sure, is fabricated into the warp and woof of what is called a leader of people.

In my humble judgment, what it takes mostly to stay on in Congress year after year, piling good record upon good record, is not so much the people's faith in the Congressman, as the Congressman's faith in the people. It is the deep conviction that there is far more goodness than badness in the simplest of us; that every human soul is striving for a happier, freer, more secure way of life, and has the right to. It is the deep assurance that one can trust most of these aspirations most of the time, and know that out of them all will come something better, not worse.

Could this not be what George Washington meant when he wrote: "The aggregate happiness of society is, or ought to be, the end of all government."

Our first President spoke not of the special needs of this or that group, but of the happiness of society as a whole. He urged that the energies of government at all levels—local, State, National—concern themselves with what is best for all, not some, in the serious business of making the laws of the land.

How much easier said than done, friends. I have seen our statesmen on the floors of Congress making decisions of grave import to the peace and security of these United States. I have felt the pressures they are under. It is far from easy to think objectively of the whole, when the voices of special interest raise hue and cry. For whether the issue be the always troublesome tariff question, or the number of refugees we bring into our country each year, a labor-management dispute, or the cost of butter, the issues are always debated in terms of the happiness and prosperity of some one, or some group.

The spirit which permeates the foregoing brief passage on the life of FRANCES BOLTON—and what it means to be a Congressman—is the spirit which has filled my life these past 9 years.

A SECRETARY LOOKS AT WASHINGTON

And now permit me to give you a fleeting glimpse of Washington itself—your Capital and mine—the city which is today writing history for millions of people in many lands. America has had to assume a position of leadership among the nations, not because of her material abundance—O wonder of providence that it is—but because of that spirit of freedom and liberty which cradled her birth a short 200 years ago.

Come, drive home from work with me on an evening in April. The rush hour is past. The sun has sunk. The soft evening air is fragrant with springtime's wonders.

Let's stop for a moment and climb the steps of that glorious temple we know as Lincoln Memorial. From the summit, one has an unobstructed view of the Capitol dome to the east. Below our feet lies the long reflecting pool, and framed within it the eternal shadow of the lofty Washington Monument. At one end of an imaginary bar which crosses this sweeping view of the Capitol lies the White House. On the other, the marble rotunda of the Jefferson Memorial. Just behind us, and across the Poto-

mac, the stately mansion of Robert E. Lee looks down from its natural pedestal on his own beloved Virginia hills.

The white crosses and tombstones of Arlington Cemetery lie folded within those hills just across the river. In the quiet of evening one can almost hear the measured step of the sentry pacing his perpetual watch before the tomb of the soldier "Known but to God."

But morning brings other glimpses of life in our beautiful Capital City.

There are the miles of wide boulevards spoking out from the Capitol Grounds and the miles of Government buildings, with their miles of corridors.

There are the storied shelves and the row after row of books in famed Library of Congress, and the seemingly endless queues of wide-eyed visitors around our historic sights, in the hot summer sun.

And everywhere in Washington there is the reminder of more gentle yesterdays which our Capital City has known. Red brick houses close to the road, flanked by shaded walks and alleys, cobbled streets and narrow, walled-in gardens to the rear, all whisper of genial colonial life in the early days of our Republic. Fashionable Georgetown society is preserving these lovely relics for modern living.

Elsewhere there is noisy evidence of new buildings springing up in answer to the incessant demand for modern offices and up-to-the-minute dwellings.

There is still another aspect of life in Washington, friends. A shocking picture it is to those who visit our Capital for the first time; slums within the shadow of the Capitol dome!

What a spectacle all this makes: the stately side by side with the sordid; the traditional vying with the modern, growth, change, displacement.

As you know, Washington has a large Negro population. There was a time when these citizens were not an integral part of life as a whole in Washington. Today they are slowly taking their rightful places among us.

Construction of the beautiful Supreme Court Building—that highest Court of the land which so recently handed down the decision on segregation—displaced hundreds of Negro families. The splendid marble building which is soon to house the Teamsters Union; and the New Senate Office likewise displaced their hundreds.

Where have these families gone? They are already becoming integrated in all areas of our Capital City. We are indeed setting an example to the Nation.

THE SECRETARY AT WORK ON CAPITOL HILL

Now where is the secretary in all of this—the young woman whom we are honoring today?

Picture her on Capitol Hill, representing the 48 stars in our flag, coming from every walk of life, laboring for every field of endeavor.

In a word, she is all of us.

Can she remain apart from all I have just discussed? I think not. As she emerges in the evening from buildings on the Hill you might think her day's work was over. But like you who have achieved success the hard way, she too must fill some portion of her evening hours with study and more work.

She stops at the beautiful Library of Congress—Congress' own Library—the largest in the world, to gather statistics. Passing through the portals and down the ornate corridors to the comfortable Reading Room, she ponders the timeless words of Francis Bacon:

"Reading maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man."

Going home that evening to retire before another long day of work, is her mind quite free of the issues argued that day in the Halls of Congress? Not entirely. Not if she is

the secretary who senses the need. You may be sure that, like her own Member of Congress, the problems and decisions of the day—for constituent and the Nation—weigh upon her thought.

There was the problem of sudden death in the family of a boy serving in our Armed Forces. Had they done everything possible to bring him home?

There was the pitiful letter from the aging widow of a Spanish-American war veteran. What help was there for her?

There was the group of farmers eager to have the Congressman understand the responsibilities they bear in feeding the American people.

There were conflicting engagements on the calendar. Had the most important ones been given preference?

The mail that day had brought more than the usual requests for assistance in the knotty cases of immigrants and refugees seeking asylum in our country.

A constituent dropped in unexpectedly from back home. The constituent is indeed the most important person on Capitol Hill. He must be given time to tell his story to the Congressman before leaving Washington. But when? Can the secretary do the impossible and arrange a meeting when the Member must be closeted all day in executive hearings, keeping one eye on the floor, where rollcalls are expected, and the other on his office?

When will the Congressman write the speech which must be delivered that weekend in his district?

True, there is aid from the experienced staff to deal with all these problems. In some congressional offices there is the legal expert who carefully scans the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each morning, keeps track of the issues, their meaning, and the status of bills on the legislative calendars.

There is the experienced researcher and writer, constructing speeches for the Member out of scraps he has written on the backs of envelopes, preparing statements for the press.

There are the countless tasks which no machine yet conceived can do: the gracious notes of thanks, preparing tickets for travel, keeping harmony between overworked staff members, parceling out the work from an incoming mail basket filled six times each day by mail handlers within the building. The eternal jangling of the phones causes continuous interruptions, but telephone voices must show no irritation.

Time and again it is proven that the secretary, or the person in the executive position, must rely on that something which we like to call the sixth sense to make everything click like a precision instrument.

Even Sally Brown must rely on this sixth sense.

Who Is Sally Brown?

Sally is gay and pretty and young. She had 2 years of junior college and 3 months at business school. Her grades were good. She hurried through business school because of general aptitudes and her eagerness to be earning.

Sally is willing to learn, if someone is willing to teach her. She tries to keep personal telephone calls to a minimum, to come to work on time, and to work fairly constantly between breaks for coffee, lunch, coffee, and going home. She's even willing to cut her lunch period short if she must fly home at 5 for an early date.

But, friends, this young woman, except for some miracle of circumstance, is not long for our profession. She is on her way to a more exciting job, a long vacation, or whatever else will give relief from humdrum routine and the business of getting ahead—way ahead.

Her job is primarily for the purpose of earning a livelihood. She is perhaps filling a gap between young womanhood and marriage.

Now, I will not argue as to whether Sally and Joe will make a happy union, since this most wonderful institution of matrimony itself takes talent and imagination, sacrifice, and, above all, devotion to ideals.

Fortunately for Sally, American enterprise furnishes thousands of opportunities to keep her gainfully employed during this interim state of existence. But it is sad to realize that this young woman will miss the opportunities everywhere prevalent—in every business endeavor—to apply her talents in a way to pay rich rewards to herself and her employer.

Friends, I have not come to Youngstown today to speak about Sally Brown, because she is not representative of the secretary who has won laurels for our profession over the decades.

There is an extraordinary shortage of expert secretaries today. Despite the Sally Browns, and despite the fact that employers are paying higher salaries than ever before, there just aren't enough of them to care for the Nation's business.

AMERICA'S MECHANICAL SERVANTS

The wonders of the 20th century have brought to offices the marvelous machines and timesavers of which we are all familiar. They have literally taken labor off the backs and out from under the fingers of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, and many others.

May I, at this point, pay tribute to these wonderful machines, and to the creative genius of the manufacturers who gave them to us.

Like many a GI stationed all over the world, I have seen the look of tragedy and suffering in the faces of our brothers and sisters in the Far East, staggering under backbreaking labor all their lives for want of the automatic servants which we in America take so much for granted.

I have seen the look of childlike wonder come into the eyes of an Indian bearer running his finger over the sharply honed edge of an American razor blade. I have seen a woman's finger caress a safety pin. I have found such booty as a sewing needle, a tube of tooth paste, a broken fountain pen, a can of milk, rolled up in a bit of dirty cloth and tucked away in a secret hiding place.

Friends, I repeat here something I have said many times before, that in the treasury of the Queen of Sheba, with its rare and priceless gems, its ivory, tapestries and cloth of gold, were not such riches as can be found today on a single counter of an American 5- and 10-cent store.

Let us think often of the genius behind the tools which have brought into practical being our American way of life. From the indispensable zipper to the powerful hydraulic presses which stamp out automobile bodies at a single blow, these are the servants of Americans. And we are fast introducing them to people all over the world or their comfort and their well-being, just as fast as they can be absorbed into their economies.

GOOD SECRETARIES ALWAYS IN DEMAND

Figures show that only about 15 percent of the offices in our country have accepted these mechanical timesavers.

But I submit, friends, that if and when every business establishment in our Nation has the means to buy every modern machine invented, they will not have engaged the heart and soul of the secretary, or that sixth sense by which she has grown into a citizen with specific and definite responsibilities.

The bell tolls today for secretaries everywhere. They no longer dare to look upon their profession as a source of livelihood only—necessary as that is to us all. The secretary can and must create the power to serve her fellowman and her country with

more skill than ever before, and with more dedication of purpose.

Her services are demanded even beyond the boundaries of our country. I was told just this week how many women are needed today in our foreign service. They must of course have adequate education, and meet other standards, but first and foremost they must have an appreciation for the high significance of serving their country abroad. Many women in our foreign service have risen to posts of great importance due to the faithful application of the talents which they took to their posts.

The age is past when the secretary's share in our common heritage was insignificant. Ours is no more a society which excludes certain professions from full participation in duties and privileges.

AMERICA THE BASTION OF FREEDOM

America has accepted world leadership with all its costs and dangers. We have become the most prosperous and dynamic unit of production the human race has ever known.

We are a vast empire with an enormous reach into all the oceans, and with obligations and responsibilities on every continent.

But all around these continents of the Americas there is dreadful evidence of man's inhumanity to man. There are countries where oppression represents a threat to our own borders. In these countries men are not free but are deprived of those inalienable rights upon which our own way of life is based and which we take so much for granted.

Here in Youngstown you make steel. In many countries behind the Iron Curtain citizens peer out from behind prison cells of steel.

Recently Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in Washington: "Today a third of the world's population—800 million people—live in a nightmare world which has no counterpart in the world of reality."

And wasn't it Abraham Lincoln who expressed the conviction that the ideals of freedom contained in the Declaration of Independence should "give hope to all the world for all future time?"

Not only have those words of Lincoln not yet materialized, but our country is in a position today of having to defend its own freedoms.

Why are these freedoms in danger?

Because totalitarianism, which today enslaves 800 million people is trying to persuade these people that life in America under our constitutional process of government is worse than life in concentration camps.

If these 800 million people are persuaded to believe these pernicious lies, it may be very difficult to keep totalitarianism away from our borders.

VOICE OF AMERICA

America, therefore, is faced with the important problem of trying to get in touch with these people, to tell them the true story about our country and our way of life. We are not telling them that we are going to liberate them—let's be clear about that—nor are we trying to force our way of life upon them. But we are trying to explain that we truly mean it when we say that we want to live at peace with the entire world.

The Secretary then, like every citizen who loves his freedom, should solemnly consider the meaning of the activities of that agency of Government which we call the Voice of America. Its vast network of powerful transmitters is carrying America's message in 38 languages to the oppressed of the world.

Through this agency, as Mr. Dulles said, 800 million people of the world are receiving the only "gleam of truth, and perhaps the hope and courage to keep them alive."

It is possibly too early to tell what the true effectiveness of this costly program is. What we do know is that the best experts of Soviet Russia have put millions of dollars into the most modern jamming apparatus that can be contrived in an attempt to prevent the beams coming from America from reaching the ears of millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In a few minutes you will see a short film descriptive of the operation of this dynamic program.

May I say at this point that the United States Information Agency is today recruiting people—both men and women—for its staffs at home and abroad.

This Agency is not alone in needing able secretaries to fill the many vacant posts through Government. The point to remember is that special requirements are needed for each of them, and proper application should be made to the respective agencies. Congressional offices don't get you these jobs, but are happy to supply information as to how applications can be made.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS ALL

In conclusion, may I say that a more somber word of warning was never written in any age than that which we find inscribed on the beautiful Archives Building in Washington: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The challenges of the 20th century and the atomic age call for dedicated men and women to carry the burdens of high office.

One thing is sure. What the most insignificant citizen feels unable to do, his Congressman—perhaps even his President—may not be able to do. Because, ladies and gentlemen, the President, your Senators, and your Representatives in this free country of ours, are the people.

My appeal to secretaries then, is:

Be not just skilled and alert in carrying out the functions of our profession, but ready and eager to offer a higher service by understanding both our domestic and foreign policies.

Remember that no individual or no smallest private industry can exist today apart from those interests and responsibilities which are the lot of our Government to carry. And because we stand closer than ever to the bastions where a life-and-death struggle may be going on in defense of our freedom, it is indeed a moment of grave importance to us all.

When foreboding clouds threatened the beloved country of Abraham Lincoln in 1861, as he took leave of his friends in Springfield, he spoke certain words which have deep meaning, I believe, for America today.

I could not do better than to leave these immortal words with you:

"Without the assistance of that Divine Being, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN SECRETARY, NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL 23-30, AND NATIONAL SECRETARIES' DAY, APRIL 27

In keeping with the best traditions of their profession, secretaries throughout the United States are shouldering vital responsibilities. They are performing important roles in commerce, industry, and government, and are bringing to their positions a wider knowledge of world affairs and of the affairs of business than was considered a necessary part of their sphere in the past.

The American secretary is an integral part of the economy which has brought to the world the American way of life—free enterprise, freedom of choice, and the highest standards of living existing in today's troubled world.

To honor the secretaries already performing their duties with diligence; to pay tribute to those constantly striving to improve their skills and abilities better to equip themselves as a part of the management team; and to encourage others to enter this worthy profession, it is essential that rightful recognition be given.

Therefore, during this special week we should fully honor the first lady of business—the American secretary.

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.
LILYAN MILLER,
President, National Secretary Association.

SHELDON F. HALL,
President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute.

Confusing and Discouraging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if there is one policy of the Eisenhower administration which has received the united support of Republicans, as well as substantial support of

Democrats, it is the effort to get the Government out of businesses which can be carried on by individuals or private organizations.

This because thinking individuals know that, inasmuch as Government depends upon tax dollars for its existence, every time the Government eliminates a business which pays taxes it lessens its ability to operate—or must replace the lost tax by additional levies.

In the 83d Congress, without opposition, the House passed a bill introduced by me, the purpose of which was to get the Government out of taxpaying businesses. It was late in the session, hence, the bill did not reach the floor of the Senate.

The administration, by Executive action, has been trying to get the Government out of civilian activities, but legislation is needed.

May 12, last, when the bill making appropriations of \$31,488,206,000 for the Department of Defense came before the House, it carried a section which made it difficult for the administration to curtail Government operations. An amendment designed to further the administration's purpose to get the Government out of activities usually performed by taxpayers was first adopted by the House when in committee by a vote of 160 to 134, but, then on rollcall, was defeated by a vote of 102 to 184. Some Members for no apparent reason reversed their position.

INCONSISTENCY

When the amendment came on for a vote in committee, those who had supported a similar principle in the 83d Congress again consistently voted for it; but on the rollcall vote, many switched positions and voted against it.

Naturally, no Member attempts to tell another how he should vote but it certainly is surprising to see Members of Congress within an hour on as simple and sound a proposition as was this do an about face.

Perhaps one reason for a switch from a position designed to protect the taxpayers to one permitting the Government to engage in commercial activities was in part due to the fact that the Member had a Government enterprise in his District.

The vote not only found the leaders on the Republican side in opposite camps but it also found top-ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations on opposite sides.

DISCOURAGING

Here is the discouraging feature of that action. Everyone knows that, if the Federal Government is to transact the business normally carried on by taxpayers, whether it be production, transportation, merchandizing, or storage of any item, crowding the taxpayer out, ultimately it will destroy itself. Republicans missed the boat on this one. Reason—lack of vigilance, party organization, personal interest.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, turning aside for this hallowed moment from the violence and turbulence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. In Thy presence our faith is strengthened in the supremacy of ultimate decencies. In the silence we hear the ancient assurance: Be still, and know that I am God.

We pray that Thy cool hand may be laid upon our fretting natures and our fevered spirits. Make us quiet before Thee, quiet enough to see the paths our feet must tread, quiet enough to hear Thy voice, quiet enough to realize that in Thy will is our peace and that Thou wilt never leave us without guidance. Teach us by Thy lessons. Show us Thy purpose. Sober us by Thy chastisements, and make us the instruments of a durable peace as in this hour of crisis and tension we lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods

from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the task force of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until next Tuesday at noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and me-